

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1873.

I.—ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY IN THE FIRST AGE.

Origines Ecclesiasticæ. The Antiquities of the Christian Church. With two Sermons on the Nature and Necessity of Absolution. By JOSEPH BINGHAM, Rector of Havant. Reprinted from the Original Edition, MDCCVIII-MDCCXXII. With an Enlarged Analytical Index. 2 vols. 4to. London, 1870.

The Works of that Learned and Judicious Divine, Mr. Richard Hooker. With an Account of his Life and Death. By ISAAC WALTON. Arranged by the Rev. John Keble, M. A., late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford, Professor of Poetry. Third American, from the Last Oxford Edition. 2 vols. 8vo. New York. 1854.

The Kingdom of Christ Delineated. In two Essays on Our Lord's Own Account of His Person; and of the Nature of His Kingdom, and on the Constitution, Powers, and Ministry of a Christian Church as appointed by Himself. By RICHARD WHATELEY, D. D., Archbishop of Dublin. 8vo. New York. 1864.

History of the Apostolic Church. With a General Introduction to Church History. PHILIP SCHAFF. 8vo. New York. 1857.

History of Congregationalism: From about A. D. 250 to 1616. By GEORGE PUNCHARD. Salem. 12mo. 1841.

The Conversion of the Roman Empire. The Boyle Lectures for the Year 1864. Delivered at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B. D., Rector of Lawford, Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons. 12mo. New York. 1866.

James, the Lord's Brother: Whose Son was He? What was his Position in the Church? etc. By Rev. CHAUNCEY W. FITCH, D. D., Rector of St. James Church, Piqua, O. New York. 1858. pp. 83.

IT is one of the chief reproaches brought against the various Protestant Churches by Romanist writers, that they have no saints and no martyrs; that they claim no interest in the lives and deaths of those holy men of the primitive Church who wave their hands to us,

and show their palm-branches across a sea of blood. And the reproach is not undeserved. For while occasionally a writer or preacher of our faith will pause to eulogize the martyrs who first died for Jesus, the reader or the audience, with true Protestant scrupulosity, receives it with languid interest and many grains of allowance.

The truth is, that Protestantism conceives itself in a logical exigency, which requires it to ignore, if not to repudiate, the historical Church as a whole. Setting itself to return to the primitive purity and simplicity, it has not been content to pursue the only possible road, by retracing all the steps of the apostasy, clutching the thread of historical continuity in the Church, while it "proves all things and holds fast to that which is good;" but has ambitiously attempted to return *per saltum*. In its own conception, it has reached the age of inspiration at one bound; and, standing there, has resolved not to reform, but to reconstruct the Church, and restore the state of things found in the New Testament. Facing round from this platform, it has cut away the whole bridge of history which spans the gulf of sixteen centuries. It lets go of every thing good and bad which lies between the day of inspiration and the day of Luther. The central mischief in Protestantism is Catholicophobia. It blinds eyes that would otherwise see the truth, and perverts minds that would otherwise judge righteous judgment. The average Protestant, whose studies in Church history have been mainly through the columns of his denominational newspaper, aided by occasional lectures or sermons of his minister on Roman Catholicism, has a very distinct impression that true Christianity expired about the end of Paul's two-years' lease on his "hired house" at Rome, and was only revived from the dead by the voice of Martin Luther. These convictions are not confined to the ignorant and unlearned. Learned and unlearned alike have shared them. They have been a common legacy to us all, from a disturbed and revolutionary past. To sane and reasonable minds, there has seemed to be absolutely no historical connection between ourselves and the Great Apostle, and between his Christianity and ours.

I say, to sane and reasonable minds; for there have been many wild and irrational, as well as utterly ludicrous, attempts to span this gulf of history. It is manifest that the only chance of finding a Church "against which the gates of hell have not prevailed," outside of the Roman Communion, is to seek it among the sects and heresies cut off

and anathematized, and sometimes persecuted, by Rome. The whitewashing of bad characters has become a favorite historical recreation ; but nowhere has it had such a wholesale development as among a certain class of Protestant historians, who, in order to provide their own respective sects with a spiritual ancestry, are accustomed to resurrect a whole host of forgotten heretics, bestow imaginary doctrines and practices upon them, distort the most of the few facts known concerning them, suppress the remainder, and then coolly ask us if we do not see quite a family likeness to themselves. As a sample of this kind of work, we might have quoted Orchard's "History of the Baptists," a book of considerable rural notoriety, especially in the denomination in whose interest it is written. But we content ourselves with a reference to the little work of Punchard, which we have placed at the head of this article. According to this author, Congregationalism (New England Puritanism) comes down to us by the line of the Novatians, Donatists, Luciferians, Aerians, Paulicians, and (making a leap of several centuries), lastly, the Waldenses and Albigenses. Chronology and geography flee away from the face of an author so bent on proving his point that he sticks at nothing. The clinic baptism of Novatian, the bigoted intolerance of the Donatist faction, the Arianism of Aerius, are all palatable, apparently. Like the line of supposititious Scottish kings, whose portraits are shown at Edinburgh, which runs back to Troy and King Priam, we believe, and is traced down through a horde of naked Picts with unpronounceable names, this fanciful genealogy is exhibited on the principle that any body will do for an ancestor. One would think that a Church, or a system, robust enough to survive such a pedigree, might contrive to get along moderately well without any. "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church," is the confession which Christendom has made for ages ; and by it is meant no more than this, that, as between the heresy of the age, whatever that might be, or the heresy of past ages ; as between the sectarianism, the private view and opinion of individual men, the opinion of Novatian, Donatus, Arius, Aerius, or others, and the broad concurrent faith of the Christian world,—I adhere to the latter, and reject the former. In this confession we most heartily join, more especially that our reading of history continually strengthens the conviction that, as between the Church and the heretics (at least during the earlier centuries), Scripture and right were usually on the side of the Church ;

and on that side was ranked, for the most part, the virtue and piety and holiness of each succeeding age.

Those Protestants who are too rational to attempt to found upon this quicksand of confusion, heresy, and schism, have contented themselves by asserting a theoretical and sentimental connection with the Apostolic Church, and hold themselves under no obligation to reverence, or even to understand, an historic past in the Church this side the age of inspiration. The truth may be, that Protestantism, while striving to realize in itself the inward verities of the Christian religion, has seen, in these ages which it ignores, no reflection of its objective self; and it has hence been a blind instinct, rather than intelligent judgment, which has caused it to turn away from them as being able to teach nothing true or valuable.

But our indebtedness to the historical Church is too great to be forever disregarded. The resources, both of learning and of devotion, which are at the command of Protestantism, can not be forever squandered upon theories and ingenious disquisitions upon the Church *as it ought to be*. Protestantism has fairly gone to seed with theories and fancies and whimsical hypotheses of what the Church *must have been*. The interests of historical criticism and of religion both demand that the Church *as it was* should be recognized, and that our starting-point in all discussions of the history of the Church should be, not, as is too common, with the postulate that the whole story of fifteen centuries is one of apostasy and error (which may be rejected in the mass, without examination in detail), but that we should start with the *facts* which are ascertainable, and which are neither to be ignored nor explained away.

In spite of our repugnance to the term, there is much in our religion that has come by the channel of tradition that is true, and much that is of priceless value. First of all, the New Testament itself. Let those who plead for "New Testament Christianity" understand clearly what they mean. If they mean that Christianity, in all of its faith, motives, hopes, and spirit, is contained in the New Testament, and that this Book is the source of all spiritual and subjective development, they are right. And they are right, furthermore, if they conceive of the Church—which is the outward form, the objective development of Christianity—as being in all its constitution and the details of its varied ministries in perfect and harmonious accord with

the principles which are revealed in the New Testament, for the nurture of the inward life. Moreover, it is in subjection to whatever legislation may be therein contained of which it is the subject. But they are undoubtedly wrong, if they conceive the Church as having been formed by, or founded on, the New Testament. The Church was builded upon "the foundation of apostles and prophets;" not upon their writings, but upon *them*. The Church existed before the New Testament, or any part of it, was written. It had its origin and its constitution from a source entirely separate from, and independent of, the written Word. Indeed, so far are we from being indebted to the New Testament for the Church, that we are indebted to the Church for the New Testament. These writings—Gospels, Acts, Epistles, and Apocalypse—were written to the Church, and for it. Nay, we might almost say, in the Church and by it; for three of the most important books were the work of men who had no place in the Apostolic College, and had only that secondary inspiration which came by laying on of apostolic hands, and which they shared in common with thousands of their brethren. By the Church of succeeding generations, these books were collected, purged of apocryphal and spurious writings, and preserved for us. It was not until the fourth century that this process was complete, and the New Testament canon took its present form.

It can not fail to strike any thoughtful student of these documents, that in them the Church is nowhere delineated or described. There is nothing analogous to the Mosaic Constitution propounded in the Pentateuch, nor to Plato's Republic, nor to the unfulfilled idea of Bacon in beginning the New Atlantis, which was to "compose a frame of laws, or the best state or mold of a commonwealth." The Church is every-where taken for granted. From the New Testament we can learn quite as much about the organization of the Roman Empire or of the Jewish Commonwealth as about the theory of the Church. The plan of its organization, the outline of its polity, nowhere appears. These things receive only that incidental notice which was unavoidable in tracing its early history. The Church exists, and has its own nurture and inspiration, its own Divine claims and authority, its heavenly origin and ineffable destiny. In pressing its demands upon the world, it does not fall back upon the written Word for support; but rather, when the Word at length is

given to it, the Word itself is upheld and supported by the authority of the Church. Our vision of the Church is not that clear and distinct perception wherewith the common eye apprehends common things. It is rather that of the Apocalyptic seer, who saw a "great wonder in heaven, a woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet." It is girded with heavenly truth, and crowned with heavenly light. In the midst of it is the shout of a king, in whose promise the Church confides: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

The Church, then, as a subject of historical examination and inquiry, has a separate basis, as well as anterior claims of its own; and can not, without fatal confusion, be considered as an historical result or product of the New Testament. The true historical relations between the two is a tempting theme, and one wholly undeveloped, if not almost untouched. It would rectify a multitude of our crude ideas about Church organization and discipline, as well as a multitude of our erroneous interpretations of Scripture, if we would make this question the subject of thorough and candid research. But, for the present, we can not enlarge upon it. It will receive further notice under another head. The only fact which we pause here to emphasize is, that the Church antedates the New Testament by many years, that two whole generations of men passed away before the Church had one complete copy of it, and that even then it was not read as affording a basis and ground of organization, a constitution, code, and outline of polity. To them it did not come, as it comes to us, as an original revelation of things unknown; but rather, in most part, as a record of things familiar, memorials of that great age of the Church, when, through all its varied ministries, the Holy Spirit spoke.

But the Church which now is, owes to the Church which then was, more than these sacred books. It is from its tradition that we derive the weekly festival of Christendom; to which, also, it gave its abiding designation, the "Lord's-day." If there was ever a Divine direction to abandon the seventh day and adopt the first as a day of sacred rest, there remains no record of it. It seems to have been the instinctive homage of the worshipping Church to its risen Lord which prompted it. The change is significant, as indicating an utter absence of the legalistic spirit, and is full evidence of the sense of freedom which they felt in following the instincts of their renewed

and regenerate natures. The manner of this change, too, deserves notice. The gradual, unintentional way in which it came about, shows that they followed no express revelation in consecrating the first day of the week. They kept the Sabbath, too, during the whole of the apostolic period, but felt safe in consecrating the Lord's-day by peculiar services and with peculiar affection.

Taking a more comprehensive survey of our debt, we may add that to this early Church we owe the fact of a Christendom. Christian civilization began then. The Church of that age grappled with heathenism, both as a religious and as a political system, and overthrew it. They had a mighty conflict; but, as many of them wrote in the Catacombs, they "overcame by the blood of the Lamb." The victory of the martyrs is the strangest and sublimest occurrence in human history. They shed no blood but their own; and with no weapon but their faith, they "overcame the world." The institutions which were most venerable and firmly established among men, sank before them, like the fading out of dreams. Every thing which, for thousands of years, had been most certainly held to be true, was proved to be false; and every thing which had been held in contempt and derision, was exalted into more than mortal grandeur and dignity—and all by the argument of blood. When, at last, the mighty Empire of Rome sank in ruins, it was because its foundations were soaked through and through in the blood of the martyrs. To this Church, then, the Martyr Church, we owe all our Christian civilization. We are not called upon to "resisit unto blood," only because their blood was so freely shed.

This brings us to the great item of our indebtedness to the historical Church, and the last which we shall mention now. Not only is the New Testament handed down to us by it, and the observance of the first day of the week, and the Christian state, but our faith itself is traditional. Faith is communicated by living hearts, not by dead books. The "ministry of reconciliation" is in men, not in books—even in God's "living oracles." There is no living man who does not owe his faith to another man who believed before him. Some other man has "begotten him by the Gospel." There is a chain of believing hearts stretching back beyond all written Gospels, to the Sepulcher and the Cross. That is the reason (in a most important sense) why we believe on Christ. Our hearts have been

made to "burn within us," by the story of his sufferings and his death and his resurrection; because we were told it by those who heard it from Mary Magdalene and the sorrowing Mother, from John the Beloved, and Thomas the Doubter, who afterward believed. Without this chain of believing hearts, we would not have believed on Him. Why does nobody believe on Jupiter? We can not account for it by the easy answer that his religion is destitute of evidences which are indispensable to faith. Once his worship was commensurate with civilization. With or without evidence, mankind believed on him, and worshiped him for thousands of years. His last worshiper died more than a thousand years ago, and nobody will ever build another altar, or devote another victim, to him. He will never have another worshiper. The broken chain can never be reunited.

We are thus attached by living filaments to those brethren who sleep in the Catacombs, who were slain with the sword, who were thrown to the lions, who were burned as torches in the streets of Rome. They are among the "ministers by whom we have believed." It is true, in the very nature of things, that "faith comes by hearing," and that "we can not hear without a preacher."

These are some of our undeniable obligations to the historical Church, and to that current of tradition which, beginning in it, has descended to us. But if this current has been so richly freighted, and its assistance is so indispensable to us, can we stop here and refuse to acknowledge every thing else that it brings? Is it improbable that, along with the Church and the New Testament, it has brought some of those great features of ecclesiastical polity which have prevailed in the Church during the whole of its historical period?

Many attempts have been made to explore the usages and historical conditions of the early Church, and to give a rational and credible account of its exciting memorials. Among them all, the great work of Bingham stands without a rival. The first volume of the original edition appeared in 1708, and the ninth and tenth volumes, which concluded the work, in 1722. The matchless erudition and amazing industry displayed in this work, render it improbable that it will ever be superseded in its peculiar province. We are thankful, therefore, for this new edition, or rather *reprint* from the original edition, "for students," which is in a form and at a cost which

make it accessible to all. His plan is to present the antiquities of the Christian Church in a methodical manner, as had been done by others for Greek, Roman, and Jewish antiquities, digested and arranged under certain proper heads. All the "ancient customs, usages, and practices of the Church," for four or five of the first centuries, are thus given, though upon some topics his researches have extended to still later times. Whoever would know the *facts* which illustrate the polity of the ancient Church, must read Bingham. They are to be found so fully, so clearly, and so impartially stated, and so well digested, nowhere else.

And so we may say, that whoever would know the *power* of these facts, their philosophy, their bearing, their argumentative force, must read Hooker's "Ecclesiastical Polity." This great work, like Bingham's, stands without a rival and without a successor. No work is likely to be written which will supersede it. The title of the "Judicious Hooker" is likely to be as enduring as our literature. Nevertheless, we suspect that his work is much neglected by clergymen in modern times; but we know of no author whom they could more advantageously study. Besides the information they would acquire from him, there would be the inestimable advantage of intercourse with an author whose perfect fairness, tolerance, and candor make him the very model and exemplar of what a clergyman ought to be in controversy. It is safe to say that no man who has not studied these two authors is competent to form a reliable opinion upon the subject of Ecclesiastical Polity in the first age of the Church. It is a very easy thing to adopt a whole set of opinions on this subject from some theorist, like Neander, or Mosheim, or Lyman Coleman; but it is a far safer thing, as well as a far nobler exercise of the understanding, to study the facts for one's self independently, and then to deduce from them conclusions of one's own.

The great vice of those who have written on this subject, as well as the easily besetting sin of those who read, is to erect the present times, and the familiar conditions of our Church life, into a sort of standard by which to compare and try whatever comes to us from the past. Bingham, in his first Preface (Vol. I, p. 9), unveils this danger, and justly censures writers "who varnish over the novel practices of the Romish Church, and put a face of antiquity upon them; to which purpose they many times represent ancient customs in disguise, to

make them look like the practices of the present age, and offer them to the reader's view, not in their own native dress, but in the similitude and resemblance of modern customs." Cardinal Bona, likewise, as quoted by Bingham, exposes and condemns the same tendency, reflecting upon some "who measure all ancient customs by the practice of the present times, and judge of the primitive discipline only by the rule and customs of the age they live in; being deceived by a false persuasion, that the practice of the Church never differed in any point from the customs which they learned from their forefathers and teachers, and which they have been inured to from their tender years."

This species of prepossession is of that class which Bacon calls "Idols of the Den."* He says:

"Every body (in addition to the errors common to the race of men) has his own individual den or cavern, which intercepts and corrupts the light of nature; either from his own peculiar and singular disposition, or from his education and intercourse with others, or from his reading and the authority acquired by those whom he reverences and admires, or from the different impressions produced on the mind, as it happens to be preoccupied and predisposed, or equable and tranquil, and the like; so that the spirit of man (according to its several dispositions) is variable and confused, and, as it were, actuated by chance; and Heraclitus said well, that men search for knowledge in lesser worlds, and not in the greater or common world."

However hard it may be, then, or however distasteful it may be, "to ward off, or expel, the idols of the den," it is absolutely necessary that this should be done before any investigation undertaken by us can have valuable results. The peculiar prepossessions under which all Protestant peoples lie, in regard to the subject before us, will come up for incidental notice from time to time as we proceed. There is one result, however, of centuries of dogmatism, which, lying at the very threshold of this subject, will perhaps be more appropriately noticed here than elsewhere. That is, the effort which is every-where made to find in the New Testament what it does not contain. It was a great shock to the religious world to be made to acknowledge that the Bible does not teach astronomy as Galileo and Copernicus taught it; and many people can not be persuaded that it does not teach geology. It is not enough for them that it is demonstrated that there is no *conflict* between any fact pertaining to science, and any

* "Nov. Org.," I, 42.

statement of inspiration. They insist that the rudimentary principles of the leading branches of science must have been taught in the Pentateuch and the Book of Job. They do this for the *honor* of the Bible.*

And so there are those who can not be made to understand, and regard it as little less than impiety to affirm, that the New Testament does not propound a constitution or theory of organization for the Church. Their argument is, It is there, because it *must* be there. The polity of the primitive Church, including discipline, sacraments, and ritual, is all laid down there, or else we can know nothing certainly about it. In vain do we ask, *where?* The finger is pointed to a page neither of the Gospels, Acts, Epistles, nor Apocalypse, but to the binding of the book as it lies shut upon the table; and you are compelled to content yourself with the assurance, "*It is there!*"

The cardinal principle which must guide the student of any science is, that his authorities contain just what they do contain, and no more, and no other. Now, let us say again that the New Testament contains no constitution for the Church, and no detailed exhibition of its organization. We can only indirectly and indistinctly perceive that it has any organization at all.† Whatever allusion or reference to it does occur, is incidental, and seems enforced by the necessity of making something else intelligible. But one large and significant fact, which, in truth, is a mere generalization of the New Testament history, has been strangely overlooked, for the most part, in our discussions of this period; and that is, that the Church, during the whole of the space covered by the inspired writings, was

* Professor Maury, the father of meteorological science in this country, quotes from Solomon and from Job to show that his valuable discoveries, in relation to the circulation of atmospheric currents and the rain-fall, were anticipated in statements such as these (Ecc. i, 6, 7): "The wind goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north; it whirleth about continually; and the wind returneth again, according to his circuits. All the rivers run into the sea; yet the sea is not full; unto the place from whence the rivers come, thither they return again." (Physical Geography of the Sea.) And to some eyes there was a profound knowledge of geology displayed in the words of Job: "There is a *vein* for the silver, and a *place* for the gold, where they find it." In the days of *placer* mining there was an aptness in the latter quotation, which it does not have to those who are familiar with quartz-mining—who find gold, as well as silver, in veins.

† The religious movement, to the advocacy of which the Christian Quarterly is devoted, sprang out of an aphorism of Thomas Campbell, (*clarum et venerabile nomen*) that, "*When the Scriptures speak, we speak; and when the Scriptures are silent, we are silent.*" Now, here, right on the face of the Sacred Page, is *such a silence*, so marked, so significant, as to challenge study.

under an *apostolical constitution*. The whole Church, in all its discipline and varied ministries, was developed out of the Apostolic College. The apostolate included all subordinate offices in itself. An apostle was at the same time prophet, evangelist, presbyter, or bishop, and deacon. This point is strongly put by Dr. Schaff, who further remarks :

"This universal official character belonged in the highest sense to Christ. He is expressly called apostle (Heb. iii, 1); prophet (Jno. iv, 19, etc.); evangelist (*εὐαγγελιστάς*, Eph. ii, 17); calls himself the Good Shepherd [or pastor] (Jno. x, 11); and condescends, notwithstanding his participation in the Divine government of the world, to take even the title of deacon or servant. (Lu. xxii, 27, etc.) And all the various branches of the spiritual office are the organs through which Christ himself, in the Holy Ghost, continues to exercise on earth his offices of prophet, priest, and king."*

The apostles, from first to last, govern, rule, guide, and teach every-where, all men, all Churches. At first they sit in joint administration of the affairs of the single congregation at Jerusalem; afterward, the work enlarging, it was divided among them, and each had his own field of labor, over which he singly was overseer. Paul declares (Ga^l. ii, 9) an express arrangement, by which he and Barnabas were to "go unto the heathen," while James, Cephas, and John should "go to the circumcision." It also seems certain that, as circumstances changed, these arrangements were altered to suit them; for John, who was originally assigned to the "circumcision," after the death of Paul appears to have taken charge of at least a part of his vacant field, and to have passed many years, and even to have ended his life, among the Churches in Asia Minor. Scripture and tradition agree in connecting his name with the Ionian coast and the archipelago. There can be but little doubt that the mother Church at Jerusalem was the special charge of James, the brother of our Lord. It is a perfectly voluntary and fatuous ignorance of the New Testament, the result of most indiscriminating and unintelligent reading, that imagines these apostles as being held in honor in the Church, merely on account of their *inspiration*, and having no authority except when they spoke as prophets, revealing the mind of the Spirit. Their greatest function, their most constant occupation, that which gave them the greatest concern and labor, was the government which they exercised as overseers and pastors of the whole Church. Not

* "Apostolic Church," page 499.

only is it true that they marked the policy and controlled the action of the Church in its larger sense, it is equally true in the most limited congregational usage of the word. They controlled the action of local Churches, and even of individual men. They administered discipline, and inflicted pains and penalties, not as the legislative, but as the executive, branch of Christ's government on earth.

We have spoken of the Church, under this state of facts, as being under an "apostolical constitution;" and so in strictness it was. But, in the very nature of things, this constitution could be only in the place of a bridge leading to something in the future. It could only continue while the apostles lived. And a Church so governed and held together, must fall to pieces as soon as the death of the apostles removed the bond. When apostolic voices were no longer heard among them, who would be empowered to speak with that authority which the apostles had been often compelled to use? What could prevent disorganization and ruin? Here arises the great problem in ecclesiastical history, the *questio vexata* on which turns all other questions regarding the polity of the early Church; namely, *What measures were adopted to supply to the Churches that discipline and control exercised by the apostles before their decease?*

The congregational organization existed in a certain shape, as we shall see presently; but what was there to be over the mere local assembly? We are accustomed to answer, that *the apostles left their writings behind them for this purpose*. This is one of those "idols of the den" against which we must be always guarded. It is an idea suitable rather to our time and experience than to that age in which we locate it. It presupposes the writings of the apostles and evangelists universally diffused among the Churches, and in the hands of all Christians, as they are to-day. In short, we are cheating ourselves with the old trick of foisting upon antiquity modern ideas which it knows not, and which are wholly incompatible with it. Copies of the New Testament in the second century, and for centuries afterward, were so rare and costly, that it is doubtful whether any but the largest and wealthiest Churches could possess an entire one. It was an act of imperial munificence, when Constantine commissioned Eusebius to have fifty copies of the Holy Scriptures (probably portions only) in Greek, prepared for the use of the Churches in Constantinople. This was in the beginning of the fourth century.

When the apostles died, and left their writings as a legacy to the Church, so far were all from having access to them, that it was two hundred years before they were universally diffused from East to West; and even as late as A. D. 325, the Council of Nice was compelled to settle the canon, and decide between the genuine writings of the apostles and the flood of spurious Acts, Gospels, and Epistles which were every-where circulating, and in many places accepted as parts of Holy Scripture.

The age of Guttenburg and the age of Luther are the same; and it might almost be said that the printing-press is a Protestant institution, such was its mighty efficiency in promoting the Reformation. Thanks to its agency, in any American village ten copies of the New Testament can be bought for one dollar; and multiplied millions of copies in all the languages of the earth are annually given away, without money and without price. No man, at least in any Protestant country, is debarred by poverty from possessing a copy of the Holy Scriptures in his own tongue. But how forgetful and inconsiderate we are when we imagine the same conditions in the post-apostolic Church! Even if the Scriptures had been thus widely disseminated, they could not have been read by the masses. So that this idea involves not only the printing-press and the Bible Society, but also the additional anachronism of the common-school system, all in the second century of the Christian Era.

In order that we may appreciate the necessities of the case, let us look a little into the conditions of Church life in that era. The Churches were not small organizations scattered thinly over the rural districts, with here and there a feeble congregation in the petty towns, as with us. Primitive Christianity was urban in its character. It began its career in the midst of the swarming populations of the great capitals of the Empire, and it was not long until Antioch, Alexandria, Corinth, and Ephesus were more Christian than pagan. Indeed, the word "pagan" itself is a surviving witness of the fact here stated. Pagan is from *pagus*, a village; and, in the language of Cicero, the "*pagani*" were the villagers as distinguished from the *urbani*, or citizens of the capital and the great towns. But after a while it came to mean the worshipers of the old false gods, because the towns were converted to Christianity, while the small villages and the country districts, in general, still adhered to the old religion.

Up to the closing of the New Testament canon, although some of the Churches in these great cities had become very numerous, yet, so far as we know, there had never been erected a single house for Christian worship. The spacious cathedral, with "long-drawn aisle and fretted vault," was as yet impossible to them. Their poverty and the intermittent persecution to which they were subject, alike forbade. Consequently, those mighty congregations of Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus, and Corinth, never met together in one place. It was impossible that these thousands should ever deliberate upon questions of order or discipline, or any other questions which arose in their Church life. It is manifest that our modern congregational system, which involves such deliberations by the whole body, is unadapted to meet the necessities of such a state of things. It works well only while congregations are small, weak, and scattered; and, unfortunately, its influence is to keep them in that condition. Democracy is proverbially and unintelligently jealous, and will usually prefer to see the ends of good government defeated rather than alter its means of attaining them.

But there was a congregational system in use in the apostles' time; far enough removed, however, from any in vogue among us. There were all over these cities *groups* of Christians, who were wont to meet together at the houses of some of their number. The language of Scripture warrants us in calling them "Household Churches." Aquila and Priscilla had a "Church in their house," at Rome (Rom. xvi, 5); and so it seems they had when they abode at Philippi. (1 Cor. xvi, 19.) Nymphas, at Laodicea, had a "Church in his house." (Col. iv, 15.) The groups of disciples who are greeted in the Epistles, especially in the letter to the Romans, seem to have been such household Churches; as "Aristobulus' household," who are greeted (xvi, 10); the "household of Narcissus" (ver. 11); "Asyn-critus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren who are with them" (ver. 14); "Philologus and Julia, Nereus and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which are with them" (ver. 15). These are evidently not family groups which are thus significantly addressed. (See also Philemon, ver. 2.) In his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, Paul concludes with this solemn injunction, which contains an allusion to this state of things: "I charge you, by the Lord, that this Epistle be read unto all the holy brethren." That

is, he directs that it be communicated to all these groups of disciples, these "household Churches" of Thessalonica. This segregation, which was enforced by necessity, did not interfere in the least with the unity of the body. There was still but one Church at Rome, at Ephesus, at Philippi. "Congregational independence" was a phrase, not only unheard of, but would have been abhorrent to Christian intelligence.

There can be but little doubt that the plural eldership of the Churches was designed to meet and fit in with this state of things. An elder who should be a "father" to them, and afford paternal counsel, and administer paternal discipline; who should rule them as he "ruled his own house;" to whom they were to be "in subjection with all gravity," like his own children; who should be "given to hospitality," making his spiritual household always welcome beneath his roof, and "apt to teach;" a safe counselor in all the cases of conscience and all other perplexities which arose among a people to whom the Word of God was not yet given in a written form; and who "needed some man to guide them" in studying the Old Testament,—such an one was necessary to every such little congregation in each Church. These presbyters, in consequence of having the oversight of these little flocks, were called "overseers," or "bishops." Each elder had his own work, with which no one else could intermeddle. He had likewise his own responsibility, which he could shift to no other shoulders, and which he neglected at his own peril. Our modern idea of the eldership is a committee. Our elder has no authority to move in any matter without consulting his colleagues; and thus, like every thing else which is "every body's business," nobody feels any concern whether it is done or undone, and it mostly goes undone. But there is no trace of such an idea in the New Testament. It is only another "idol of the den."

It is obvious, however, that in such an arrangement, as above indicated, there was a peculiar danger of schism and discord. How could dissension be prevented among the elders themselves? Beginning among their rulers, it must spread contagiously among the membership. While an apostle could remain with the Church of his planting, he was its bond of union, and, as we have seen, evidently its disciplinary authority to control and restrain all disorderly and ambitious elements; but when he was called away from

them, these jealousies and discords, which had been suppressed by his presence, would inevitably break out. This danger, as we shall show, was clearly recognized by the apostles; and not only recognized, but effectually guarded against. They were not in the habit of uttering that feeble lament which we hear often in the Church, in the presence of manifest evils. "If men would only do right, every thing would go right." They took it for granted always, that *some* men would not "do right," and they made provision to strip those men, as far as possible, of their power to do evil.

On his last journey up to Jerusalem,* Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus, and called the "elders of the Church," and gave them a parting charge, telling them that they "should see his face no more." He had founded this Church, and since then it had been under his constant supervision. Recently he had abode for three years with them, "warning them," as he now reminded them, "night and day, with tears." In this tender and beautiful address, he tells them that, "after his departing," not only should "grievous wolves enter in among them, not sparing the flock," but "*also of their own selves* (among the very overseers) should men arise, speaking perverse things, and draw away disciples after them." He therefore bade them to "watch," and to "remember" his counsels and his tears.

Now, what remedy did he offer for this state of things which he predicted? It would be an assertion of the apostle's unconcern in the destruction of the Churches of his planting, to suppose that nothing was done, or attempted, to prevent or remedy such evils. Some time after this, we find that he has left Timothy there,† and afterward, recalling him temporarily, has sent Tychicus‡ in his stead. To each of them, in turn, he has given supreme pastoral authority over the Church—the membership, presbytery, and all. Hymenæus and Alexander, Phygellus and Hermogenes and Philetus, were already doing that work of schism and destruction which Paul had prophesied. Timothy is commissioned to "rebuke" them, and to "stop their mouths," to "receive accusations against the elders," and (apparently) to remove them; and, when convicted of sin, to "rebuke them before all, that others might fear." We see in this commission, which is but a type of many such, evidence of the apostle's judgment,

* Acts xx, 17. † 1 Tim. i, 3. ‡ 2 Tim. iv, 12.

that with the congregation and its eldership the organization of the Church did not, *could* not terminate. There is no official designation given to Timothy in the Scriptures, in connection with the Church of Ephesus; but we see that he was essential to the order, peace, harmony, and prosperity of the Church, and that his functions, his official duties, were those of an overseer, or bishop. That he was "ordained the first bishop of the Church of the Ephesians," is declared in the subscription to the Second Epistle to him, which is older than any copy we have of the Epistle itself, and is confirmed by the universal tradition of the Church. Eusebius, Chrysostom, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Hilary, the deacon, unanimously declare it as a fact. If there be any value in any tradition whatever, one thus supported is entitled to the greatest respect. It is conjectured by some that he is the "angel of the Church of Ephesus," addressed by John. (Revelations ii, 1-7.) If it were not he, it must have been one of his immediate successors. Certain it is, from the letter to the "angel," that his station, functions, and office were such as had been conferred upon Timothy, and had been discharged by him.

It is a very careless and superficial view which sets aside these facts, as having no bearing upon the subject of the polity of the Church, from the consideration that they were done in the age of inspiration, and done by inspired men. These men did not govern and administer the Churches by virtue of their inspiration. Timothy, Titus, Epaphroditus, Tychicus, and the rest, had no more inspiration than hundreds of disciples, men and women, all over the Christian area. They did so by virtue of their official position. Their authority was derived from their ordination, their commission. And, moreover, we remark that the apostles issued these commissions, not as prophets inspired to teach, but as bishops (*ἐπίσκοποι*) appointed to rule. To them had been committed the keys of the "Kingdom of Heaven," whatever that mysterious expression may mean. They had been commissioned to "bind and loose," to "remit and retain sins;" and it is evident that unless these expressions were more empty of meaning than our Savior's words usually were, a large "authority for government and discipline was conveyed by them, with discretionary power as to its exercise; and, in order that no man might gainsay or resist it, the promise was added that

the decree enacted on earth should be registered in heaven.* The actual exercise of this "power of the keys," in a case of discipline, is seen in the treatment by Paul of that scandalous offender at Corinth, whom, in one letter, he commanded to be "delivered unto Satan" (1 Cor. v, 4, 5); and of whom, in another letter, he says: "To whom ye forgive any thing, I forgive also." (2 Cor. ii, 10.)

It is probable that most men recognize the apostles as the depositaries of some such power as this, who yet deny that they had any successors in office. Now, the question of apostolical succession is one of those questions in urgent need of calm and intelligent examination among Protestants. Is it unreasonable to suppose that an apostle could have a successor in office? Then we err in company with Peter and the rest of the early Church, who elected Matthias in the room of Judas. And it is worthy of remark that the station from which Judas had fallen, and to which Matthias was elected, is called a bishopric (*ἐπισκοπή*).† Moreover, Paul was added to the Apostolic College after the death of James, whom Herod slew—and, as some conjecture, in his room—that the sacred number twelve might be maintained. And there are others beside, who are called apostles in the New Testament, as Barnabas and Epaphroditus, Andronicus and Junia, Silvanus and Timotheus, with others who are not expressly named.‡ Here are the names of eight persons who, in some sense, were successors of the original twelve, wearing the same title, and holding in varying degrees the prerogatives and dignities of apostleship. The unqualified denial of apostolical succession is rash, and shows the lack of definition and discrimination. We can not do better than hold with Hooker: || "Such as deny the

* Whateley's "Kingdom of Christ," page 26. "They would, of course, understand by this, not that they or any of their successors could have authority to dispense with their Master's commandments; to add to or alter the terms of Gospel salvation; to teach them, in short, not to 'observe what He had commanded them;' but to enact, from time to time, to alter, to abrogate, or to restore regulations respecting matters of detail, not expressly determined in Scripture; but which yet *must* be determined in some way or other, with a view to the good order of the community and the furtherance of its great objects."

† We are unable to conjecture the grounds upon which the "Bible Union," and some other modern translators, have rendered this word "office." No various reading in the text has any countenance from the best authorities, and the word plainly means the *office of a bishop*. Doctrinal bias may explain many things; but it can scarcely excuse an obscuring of historical data, or a mistranslation of the Word of God.

‡ Acts xiv, 14; Phil. ii, 25; Rom. xvi, 7; 1 Thess. i, 1; ii, 6; 2 Cor. viii, 23.

|| "Ecc. Pol.," Book VII, iv, 4.

apostles to have any successors at all, in the office of their apostleship, may hold that opinion without contradiction to this of ours, if they well explain themselves in declaring what truly and properly apostleship is. In some things every presbyter, in some things only bishops, in some things neither the one nor the other, are the apostles' successors." No one disputes that the seven called deacons, who were ordained to oversee the daily distribution at Jerusalem, were successors of the apostles in *their* office. Equally difficult of contradiction would be the assertion that upon all of the elders and evangelists whom they ordained, they conferred a portion of their functions, with all needful authority for the due execution of them. Upon Timothy, as we have seen, there were still other and higher powers conferred, by virtue of which he presided over the whole Church to which he was sent—presbyters, deacons, and members. There were yet other powers and functions which were intransferable, which could not descend from an apostle to any successor.

We have been striving—and thus far, we hope, successfully—to make this an investigation of facts, not of *names*; but we are constrained, by charity for those whose weakness it is to be largely influenced by words rather than things, to examine briefly the title "bishop," and its history. It is certain and undeniable that the words bishop and presbyter, or elder, were at first used interchangeably in the Church to designate the same officer. It is equally undeniable that this class of officers were themselves subordinate to an authority above them. Over all the presbyteries, at first, are the apostles; afterward, the apostles' deputies, who exercise apostolic authority, but have no official designation; after these, at a long interval (more than thirty years), a class is mentioned, called "angels." This one thing is common to these different functionaries: their duty is to superintend, to oversee. What more natural than that the name overseer, or bishop, be given to them? The elders are overseers too; and so are the deacons, in a sense. But these are the overseers *par excellence*, the overseers of all. Hooker aptly and truly remarks: "With all names this is usual, that inasmuch as they are not given till the things whereunto they are given have been some time first observed, therefore, generally, *things* are ancients than the *names* whereby they are called."*

*B. VII, ii, 2.

The *thing*, the function, the office, existed, as we have seen, by the consent and direct ordinance of those whose privilege it was to "bind and loose;" and if no name were given to it by inspiration, where was the wrong in taking an expressive and appropriate title, which has been used generically to designate a lower office (which has, besides, another, a specific designation), and fixing it upon that which has none, so as to properly mark a distinction which already exists by Divine appointment? * Take the other title of "presbyter," or "elder." This was not a new title, coined fresh at the organization of the Christian Church, to be the designation of one of its functionaries. It had been in use since the Exodus, and had been employed as the designation of many different officers in the successive stages of the history of the Commonwealth of Israel. Even in the New Testament it is applied as an official title to several different kinds of men: 1. The elders of the Jews; 2. The elders of the Churches; 3. The apostles, as Peter and John, call themselves elders; 4. The four and twenty mysterious persons who in the Apocalypse are called elders. It is a curious commentary upon the supposed rigidity of New Testament nomenclature, that this word, of so great importance in the Church, should be so plastic, and should be used with such great freedom in the inspired writings. It is instructive likewise to remember the origin of the Jewish eldership, which was the prototype of the Christian. It was not of Divine origin. It was instituted by Moses as a mere expedient, at the suggestion of Jethro, his father-in-law, because the labor of judging the people was too great for him to bear alone—the same reason which caused the appointment of the seven, at Jerusalem, to serve the tables. But, although this man was not a prophet, and his counsel was in no sense the counsel of the Holy Spirit, yet his idea was afterward accepted by the Almighty, and made an integral part of the constitution which He provided for the nation. From this eldership, thus human in its origin, but of Divine adoption, the Christian eldership derived not only its name, but its being. There appears in the records of the early Church no Divine decree setting apart an eldership. It doubtless began in the exercise of that discretionary power of discipline,

* This is not the first time that man has been called upon to "see," or consider, by what name he would call the works of God. (Gen. ii, 19.)

the power of "binding and loosing," which the apostles used in the case of the seven.

There can be scarcely a doubt that modern congregational systems, however they may be *defended*, originated in the same way. The fact that no bishop joined in Luther's movement, coupled with the extreme ideas prevailing as to sacramental grace conferred in ordination, alone prevented the reformation on the Continent from assuming an episcopal complexion. The fact that, in England, it was headed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and many of his suffragans, caused the Reformed Church of England to retain this ancient feature of its polity unchanged. The Alt Catholic movement, in Germany, would have been forced into the same channel of congregationalism had not its leaders been able to effect an alliance with the Church of Utrecht, which has maintained its episcopal organization during a schism with Rome, now of several centuries duration. As between congregationalism and episcopacy, the student of ecclesiastical history and antiquities has no choice. The former was unheard of among men for the first fifteen centuries. Down to the Reformation, it was without an example or an advocate. Go back, age by age and century by century, and you find the episcopal system every-where established, within the borders of the Empire and without. In savage Russia, in barbarous Abyssinia, among the Vandals of Spain and Carthage, in the mountains of Armenia, in the wilds of Ireland, and amid the unhewn forests of Britain, every-where it exists, without question or controversy, and is held to have descended from the apostles. For ages, the history of the Church is the history of its episcopate. It is impossible to prove the existence of the Church in the second century, without proving the antiquity of this regimen. Almost every great name in the rolls of the "noble army of martyrs," belonging to this period, was a bishop. The best witnesses to the authorship and acceptance of the New Testament in that age are themselves bishops. Irenæus, who lived in the latter half of this century, and was himself Bishop of Lyons, in France, is our first and greatest witness for the antiquity of the Gospels, and is likewise the greatest, if not the first, witness to the episcopate as being of apostolic origin. He says, "We are able to number up them who, by the apostles, were made bishops;" and he gives the lists. In Rome, he declares that the apostles themselves made Linus the first bishop. Of Poly-

carp, he declares that the apostles made him Bishop of Smyrna. He himself had been a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John, the apostle. Ignatius, who suffered under Trajan (A. D. 107-116), declares that Evodius had been ordained, by the apostles, Bishop of Antioch, and he himself was his successor in that office. There is no space here for the growth of a corrupt tradition. It is an undisputed tradition of the Church that James, the Lord's brother, after his martyrdom, was succeeded by his brother Simeon, as Bishop of Jerusalem.

We have been accustomed to think of this system as having had its great development, if not its origin, under Constantine. The free exercise of the Christian religion was proclaimed by him in 314. In 325, the Council of Nice was held. Eusebius, who was present at the Council, and became its historian, gives this description of its composition, which will enable us to judge whether or not this system was already coextensive with Christianity:

"And one sacred oratory inclosed within its walls both Syrians and Ciliicians, Phoenicians and Arabians, Palestinians and Egyptians; also, Thebæans and Libyans, and those that came forth of Mesopotamia. There was present, also, at this Synod, a Persian Bishop; neither was the Scythian absent from the quire. Moreover, there appeared here Thracians and Macedonians, Achaïans and Epirotes; and such as dwelt far beyond these met, nevertheless, together."*

The bishops who composed this Synod were three hundred and eighteen in number; and of them, Merivale gives us this graphic description:

"They had all been swept over by the last storm of imperial persecution, the agitation of which had hardly yet subsided. Known to each other hitherto by the record of their trials and endurance only, they now met for a moment upon earth, trusting to be united finally in heaven—the witnesses to the faith in Rome and Antioch, at Trèves and at Carthage; witnesses to the same faith, the same law, the same sacraments, the same Lord and Master of them all. The most illustrious were soon distinguished; some were betokened by their strange dress and habits, some by their well-known reputation for zeal or for learning; some by the wounds and scars of their noble confession. Paphuntius, a confessor from the Thebaid, who asserted the right of the clergy to the society of their wives, had been blinded, and maimed in the leg. Paul, of Nea Cæsarea, was crippled by torture in the hand. Ascetics from the Upper Egypt were clothed in the wild raiment of the Baptist; they had wandered forth in sheep-skins and goat-skins; they had dwelt in deserts and on mountains, in dens and caves of the earth. The child-like simplicity of the primitive ages was instanced in Spiridion, the village Bishop of Cyprus—the prototype, it would seem, of the model prelate of a recent

* "Life of Constantine," iii, 7.

fiction, who, when brigands robbed him of his sheep, rebuked them meekly for not having rather asked him for them. The learning of the clerical order, which could compare with that of the pagan orators and sophists, was represented, among others, by Eustathius and the two Eusebii; while, for age and venerable bearing, none were more remarkable than the Spanish prelate, Hosius, and Alexander, the patriarch of Alexandria."*

We have thus sketched the polity of the primitive Church, according to the traces of it found in the New Testament records. We have shown that these traces are in the direction of the earliest historical notices, and most trustworthy traditions of the Church, which have descended from the age of its purity and simplicity. The absolute and unquestionable verity is, that the historical period of the Church, as distinguished from the New Testament period, does not embrace the rise of the episcopate. History in the Church, when it begins to show a bright torch, finds this institution in full vigor. On the other hand, the progress of doctrine in the New Testament is toward the same conclusion. We have shown that this regimen stands upon the same basis of tradition as the New Testament itself, comes to us from the same time, and has been passed down to us by the same hands from which we receive the sacred writings. The same great writers, who are quoted to show the reception of the apostolic writings by the early Church, assert, every one, distinctly and unequivocally, the apostolic origin and sanction of this venerable system.

Unfortunately, there is, just after the close of the age of inspiration, a dim tract of history, where the lamps burn so low that we can scarce see our path; and just here the ecclesiastical theorist locates a great apostasy. In this interval there was, according to his view, a sudden and universal movement in all the presbyteries of the thousands of Churches in Europe, Asia, and Africa, by which the primitive and Divinely authorized plural eldership was overthrown, and one ambitious and self-seeking presbyter in each was elevated into the place of supreme authority, and became Bishop of the Church. Now, absolute demonstration of the erroneousness of this theory is impossible, only because the force of moral evidence never amounts to demonstration. It is sufficient to say of it, that it has not one fragment of fact to sustain it, has not even a tradition in its favor, and is not only gratuitous and imaginative, but is evidently

* "Conversion of the Roman Empire," pp. 31, 32.

conceived in the interests of a system which it conveniently supports in the exigencies of controversy. Furthermore, we may say that it is incredible. Such usurpation could never have been universal, and would never have been acquiesced in without a struggle which must have left some trace in history or tradition. And, last of all, it is not in accord with the facts which are known.

As the apostles one by one passed away, making confession with their blood, they left behind them their deputies in charge of the Churches. Timothy is at Ephesus, Titus in Crete, Epaphroditus in Philippi. To these persons it has been given "to set in order," and to keep in order, these infant Churches. Is it probable that, with the death of the apostle who sent them, they felt themselves discharged from this trust? Is it probable that the Churches undertook all at once to be independent of that control and leadership, to which they had long submitted as the institution of God? What was the charter of that democratic self-government which it is supposed they claimed and enjoyed, until it was overthrown by ambition and intrigues? The volume called the New Testament, which is held to teach such doctrines, as we have seen, did not exist. The books composing it were, indeed, all written by the end of the century in which the Church began, and collections of them had begun to be made; but it is fair to presume that a single complete collection did not exist. It is reasonable to suppose that many Churches did not possess a chapter of the apostles' writings. Precedent could not be quoted; for the precedents were all the other way. They had never known any other rule than the one under which they found themselves when the apostles died. What else is reasonable but to suppose that Timothy remained at his post at Ephesus, and the others at theirs, until the time came for their testimony, and they went to the scaffold and the stake, "not counting their lives dear unto them?" When they were taken away, was it apostasy or innovation, or any thing worthy of reproach, that another, who had been prepared beforehand, or was now selected, was elevated into the perilous station of shepherd and representative of a persecuted Church? We can understand how a man might intrigue to become Archbishop of Canterbury. We know how men have steeped themselves to the lips in lies and perjury and simony, to become Popes of Rome. But when we remember what a bishopric

was in the second and third centuries, we are at a loss to understand what attractions the post could have for a selfish, an ambitious, or a corrupt man. The fact is, the bishops of that early and uncorrupted age were the successors of the apostles, not only in their station, in their labors, in their responsibilities, in their authority, but also in their patience and faith, in their self-denying lives, and their heroic deaths.

Protestantism, as we said at the beginning, claims no interest in these martyrs, no inheritance in their illustrious triumph of faith, "resisting unto blood." That it may be seen that this is not said in recklessness, but is deliberately accepted as a necessity growing out of the defense of the congregational theory, we quote from Punchard:* "*The very excellencies for which the primitive elders were distinguished, were an occasion of corruption to the Churches.*" By way of admiration at the originality of this proposition, he very justly prints this sentence in italics. He proceeds:

"This may seem a paradoxical assertion. It will, nevertheless, be found susceptible of demonstration, that the virtues of the Christian pastors of the first and second centuries were the innocent occasion of corruption to the Churches. To be a Christian pastor, in those 'perilous times,' was to take the front rank of danger; for the officers of the Churches were the first to be sought after when persecution arose 'because of the word.' To men who were ready to lay down their lives for the cause of Christ, the Churches reasonably supposed that they might safely trust their dearest rights. They would naturally choose to be guided by the opinions and governed by the wishes of such men. They would be slow to think or speak of their own ecclesiastical rights. Feeling that all was safe in the hands of their devoted and venerated pastors, they would readily dismiss all anxious care; and it would be but reasonable to suppose that ere long it would be forgotten that the Churches had any claim to those special rights and immunities which they had so long neglected to exercise."

And so it went on, until it culminated in "Babylon, the Mystery of Iniquity, and the Horned Beast," etc., etc. Well, we suppose we ought to be thankful that we have no such ministry now. Our pastors are not so dangerously good, so alarmingly virtuous and devoted, that we need have any apprehensions on their account. There is no prospect that we will soon again have saints and martyrs enough in the Church to lead us into corruption and apostasy. But "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." We are not safe so long as good men's "opinions" are quoted, or their

* "History of Congregationalism," page 18.

"wishes" influential. It behooves us to suspect and watch our ministry; and whenever we find their faith, their labor, their self-denial, their prayers, beginning to tell upon the community, we should sound the note of alarm, and do all we can to circumvent them in their wickedly pious intentions.

We do not quote this author to criticise him; "the game is not worth the candle." But we produce him as an evidence of the straits to which they are driven who attempt, on historical grounds, to set aside that "regiment by bishops, which we hold a thing most lawful, divine, and holy in the Church of Christ,"* in favor of a loose, disjointed, modern, congregational system, "neither appointed of God himself, as they who favor it pretend, nor, till yesterday, ever heard of among men."†

[NOTE.—The foregoing essay is published in the absence of the editor of the QUARTERLY, on account of its very able presentation of one phase of the question of Church Government, and as a contribution toward a better understanding of the whole question; but it must not be accepted as the editor's view, without his own approval.]

II.—PAUL'S SCHISM.

Paul of Tarsus. An Inquiry into the Times and the Gospel of the Apostle of the Gentiles. By A GRADUATE.

WE are breaking away from the ecclesiastical tyranny and bigoted adherence to dogmas and traditions, which the Church has manifested in the past, to the detriment both of Christian truth and Christian life. In dealing with the proposition, that truth is seconded by a rigorous ecclesiastical censorship, time has reduced the idea to an absurdity, and practically demonstrated the folly of the spirit which so long has reigned. Perhaps the most important lesson which experience has taught, and one which the Church ought not to be the last to learn, is, that truth, even Christian truth, can not work out any large and satisfactory results, except upon souls that are free from every other controlling influence.

* Hooker, vii, 2, 3.

† Ibid, vii, 1, 4.

But, as might have been expected, in getting away from this tyranny, and in asserting the freedom of the conscience and the duty and virtue of Christian charity, there is a tendency to a freedom of opinion and of fellowship which amazes the more conservative. We are threatened, indeed, with the utter disintegration of much that has hitherto been considered solid and sacred. Good men are, it is true, felicitating themselves in the active and hopeful efforts every-where being made to unite the different fragments of Christendom. These seem to argue—not disintegration, but a growing agreement; not latitudinarianism, but settled truth. And doubtless there is a certain progress manifested, more or less plainly, in different quarters and in different groups of religionists. At any rate, let us rejoice in Christian charity and the desire for peace; for “the fruits of righteousness are sown in peace of them that make peace.” When charity and freedom of thought work together, they will soon bring us to agreement.

A little attention to facts, however, will convince us that there is a strong and wide-spread disposition to extend Christian recognition, if not ecclesiastical fellowship, almost without regard to opinion—to make the Christian name cover whole schools of theologians, who seem to repudiate almost all that is supernatural in Christianity. Even in the most orthodox quarters, and among those who have formed the bulwark of what has been called Evangelicalism, are found many of the best minds who seriously doubt whether the religion of Jesus requires assent to *any* formula of truth, or whether any Church or religious ordinances were ever established by Divine authority, under the Christian dispensation. Faith in Christ is the very essence of his religion, it is freely granted. It is thought to be the whole of it; but faith in any defined doctrine about Christ is a very different thing. It is admitted that an ecclesiasticism and religious ordinances are necessities to public worship, and to the evangelization of the world; but it is believed that Jesus left these entirely to the wisdom of his people, to devise and to change just as, from time to time, they should feel that new forms would better express the developed Christian life of the age, or give more efficiency to the operations of the Church. Necessary expedients they are allowed to be; but only expedients, human in their origin, and subject to human reason. Jesus, it is

thought, meant only to teach the ethical and spiritual, which are eternal verities, and therefore unchangeable; and which can flourish under the light of partial truth, and in one set of ordinances as well as in another: or, if in one better than another, that may be better in one civilization which is not in another; and that may be helpful to a lower, which would be a hinderance to a higher, degree of development. So that different communions, or at least different rites, are by no means an unmixed evil, if only they are accompanied by Christian charity.

The advocates of this view are accustomed to appeal to the history of the Church, during the administration of the apostles themselves—especially to the career of Paul of Tarsus; a source which, in the hands of such men as M. Rénan and the much less radical author of "Paul of Tarsus," is made to yield considerable plausibility to this doctrine. It is well known that there were grave differences in the primitive Church concerning the relation which the law of Moses bore to the religion of Jesus. The Jewish converts adhered to the law with an affection and pertinacity which are characteristic of the race, and which the influence of the most radical and most powerful, under the leadership of Paul, was not able entirely to overcome during his life-time; nor, indeed, until the destruction of Jerusalem had scattered the nation, and broken the power of the Jewish Churches, by breaking the compactness of their local association. How far the apostles themselves were involved in this controversy, is a question in modern criticism. Some able critics, and among them the two authors above mentioned, think they find, both in the Acts by Luke and in Paul's letters, clear evidences that the question of conformity to the Mosaic Institution divided them, even to life-long contention and ultimate alienation.

The claim of inspiration is not vitiated by any difference of opinion, or heated debate at times, or on topics where revelation of the Spirit is not professed; as, it is admitted by all, was the case at many times, and with many points of no essential importance. Nor would the professed inspiration of one be vitiated by serious question and examination into the facts and evidences of the claim, where the others confess they have received no revelation on the subject, as was the case with Peter, on the occasion of the baptism of Cornelius. The case is different, however, when the question is one involving

the very genius of Christianity itself, or one on which they all claim a revelation, and yet differ radically, and life-long. Such a fact forbids the very idea of the inspiration of both parties; and we can not decide between the contestants, unless God come to the rescue, and decide which he has chosen to speak in his name—as between Moses and the magicians, Micaiah and Zedekiah, and other true and false prophets. But neither the Acts nor the Epistles speak of any such test case between the apostles. All dogmas, institutions, and ordinances, therefore, which have their foundation solely in the authority of the apostles, must be allowed to be mere human judgments and expedients, if such charges are found to be just. How far they may be true, is a question worthy of the most serious and honest inquiry. To speak a little more in detail of the facts, which modern criticism is supposed to have gathered from the history of those times, it is said: That the Christianity of Paul is the first religion that invited all men into the brotherhood of the faith. That the apostles at Jerusalem shrank from carrying the tenets of Christianity beyond the pale of the Jewish nation, but lived together in poverty and prayer; that is, an ascetic life, at Jerusalem, where they set up a hierarchical claim, such as has been seen in the Church in later times. That the Christian religion was nearly absorbed by Judaism at the beginning, and was likely to become no more than an obscure Jewish sect. That Paul saved it from this catastrophe, by the peremptory manner in which he insisted on the abrogation of the Jewish code, so far as Gentile converts were concerned; but the effort cost him a life-long martyrdom, and for a time discredited his labors and success. That this persecution came mainly from the Church at Jerusalem, under the lead of the Apostolic College, and especially from James. That, as time went on, Paul became more Catholic in his teaching and manner; the Ascetic College at Jerusalem became more scrupulous, precise, rigorous, exacting: in the presence of Paul, they are willing to effect a compromise; but when he is gone, the old exclusiveness usurps its place in their minds, they forget their concessions, and, torturing themselves with the idea that they have gone too far, seek to retract what they have granted: when Paul was at Jerusalem, James gave him the right hand of fellowship; but when he is gone to Antioch, the emissaries of James follow him in order to revoke, in detail, all that had been previously granted. That Paul, being greatly

vexed by this continual persecution, and alarmed for the safety of his Gospel, ultimately writes a strong letter to the Galatian Churches, in which, by implication, he charges the College at Jerusalem with bad faith. That "this manifesto was a final and deliberate schism, an act as defiant as the Confession of Augsburg, and vastly more complete." That under cover of a pretended hierarchical authority, the College denounced Paul as insubordinate, heretical, and schismatic; to whom evident allusion is made in the letters of Peter, and Jude, and in the Apocalypse. That Paul, by his more generous doctrine, great energy and ability, and future favorable historical events, ultimately triumphed, and gave form to the future Gospel.

From these is drawn the very rational conclusion, that "nothing can be more false and more delusive than to imagine that the first teachers of the Christian religion were men whose harmony of opinion and action was complete, who entertained one view of the Gospel, and who had neither difference nor debate nor quarrel. They were not unconscious mouth-pieces of a supernatural inspiration, automata of some uncontrollable enthusiasm, unanimous machines; but were men of like passions with ourselves, men with characters, impulses, affections, fears, dislikes—were human in the mistakes they made, and in the truths which they embraced and enunciated."

The only question of doubt which is raised here, concerning these alleged historical facts, is about the part taken in this controversy by the original Twelve Apostles, and about Paul's schism. There does not seem to be sufficient evidence, even to render it probable that they all remained in Jerusalem. If the Acts of the Apostles does not confirm those legends which scatter the Twelve in various parts of the earth, neither does it in any way disprove them. Nor does the letter to the Galatians make any affirmation which makes it necessary to suppose that they were all there at each successive visit of Paul. Those legends may not be accurate, in detail—may not, indeed, be perfectly trustworthy as to general facts; still, there is nothing to disprove them. As we have no account of any of them, save Peter and John, and James, the brother of the Lord—except a short letter from Jude, after the question of the law arose—the examination must, of course, be confined to the four above mentioned.

It will scarcely be denied that the apostles seem to have commenced preaching the Gospel without any adequate apprehension of the radical nature or measureless sweep of its mighty idea. It is not possible for the human mind to comprehend it all at once. It broke upon their minds by degrees. They began with the simple idea of justification, through faith in Christ. They did not, at first, perceive that this abrogated the Mosaic institutions, nor that it opened the way of salvation to the Gentile. The universality of the Gospel never seems to have occurred to them, until it came up for practical solution in the case of Cornelius. It was brought up, then, by a revelation to Cornelius, and answered by revelation to Peter; to whom, by Divine direction, the application was made. There seems to be a providential keeping-back of the question, until the Divine purpose was ready to call it up in accordance with the order in which Christ directed them to proceed—first to Jerusalem and Judea, and afterward to the uttermost parts of the earth. Peter, too, is selected to induct the first Gentile into the kingdom, as he was, also, the first Jew, in accordance with the promise to give him the opening keys, on account of his first announcement of the Sonship of Jesus. At any rate, God made choice that by his mouth the Gentiles might hear the Gospel. He was not reluctant, but "came without gainsaying, as soon as he was sent for;" and when he heard the request, he promptly replied: "Of a truth, I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, is accepted of him." Peter's Gospel was the first to invite all men into the brotherhood of the faith. This at once raised the question; and as soon as the apostles and brethren heard his story, they "glorified God, that repentance was granted unto the Gentiles also." So far, they do not shrink from carrying the Gospel beyond the pale of the Jewish nation. But the more serious question, whether the Gentile should submit to the law—the question that aroused Jewish feeling—had not yet arisen. It was nothing to awaken debate, when a proselyte professed the God of the Jews, if he intended to identify himself with them and their law. It does not appear, however, that Cornelius did this.

The persecution that followed the death of Stephen, scattered the Church at Jerusalem; but every fugitive became a missionary, a majority of whom preached to none but Jews. Some, however,

citizens of Cyprus and Cyrene, ventured boldly to offer the Gospel to the Grecians at Antioch. Their success was wonderful; so much so, indeed, that it now became manifest that the new Gospel was a religion independent of Judaism. It must have a name to distinguish it. No name was more naturally suggested than that of the Founder of the Faith; and the disciples were called Christians first at Antioch. These citizens of Cyprus and Cyrene were the second to preach the Gospel to Gentiles, and the first to make the general offer; though Peter had announced to Cornelius that it was open to the penitent of all nations. Paul is not even the second to invite all nations to the brotherhood of the faith. When the news came to Jerusalem that a very large community of Gentiles had been gathered at Antioch, it seems to have excited joy, but no debate. Converts so little acquainted with the Jewish Scriptures would need much Scriptural and spiritual instruction. Common prudence, therefore, called for sending some one competent to the work, to superintend their organization and education, and to appoint what ordinances were to be observed. Barnabas was chosen; and, after visiting the place, he sought Paul. That Barnabas was neither himself disposed nor instructed, by the apostles at Jerusalem, to require submission to the law, is very manifest from the fact that, at the end of perhaps twelve years, the Church at Antioch is found, by certain coming from Judea, to be entirely disregarding the law, and undisturbed by debate on the subject. This could not have been the case had Barnabas been directed differently by those who sent him. It does not appear that these Judaizing teachers, who disturbed this peace, were sent by the apostles, or that they came from Jerusalem even, but from Judea. The apostles seem, by the aid of the revelation made to Peter, to have grown out of their first narrow conceptions without the aid of Paul. From this time, however, the controversy waged, waxing stronger as time went on. On which side the apostles severally arranged themselves, remains to be seen. We have account of but four of these—Paul and Peter, James and John. The question was brought to Jerusalem, and a council assembled. On their way, however, Paul and Barnabas awakened "great joy" in all the Jewish Churches, by the announcement of the success of the Gospel among the Gentiles. These do not yet shrink from carrying its tenets abroad.

What part John took in this Council, if any, is not recorded. The views of but four members are given. Peter is first. He referred to the calling of Cornelius, said God had accepted them, had put no difference between them and Jews, purifying their hearts by faith; and, therefore, it would be tempting God to bind on the disciples what neither they nor their fathers were able to bear. The faith of Christ was enough for both parties. Paul and Barnabas followed, confirming Peter's argument, by stating that God had indicated his will by miracles and wonders in abundance. James concludes the debate; and, after referring to Peter's argument approvingly, confirms the opinion by a Scriptural argument. He himself proposed the basis of settlement, which was agreed to. Looking to the future, and in the spirit of liberty and peace, he indicates the policy which Paul ever after pursued. The terms of this adjustment are, that the Gentiles shall be free to disregard it; and, by implication, the Jews shall be free to observe it. The decision seems to have been nearly, if not quite, unanimous, including every apostle present. "It pleased the apostles and elders, and the whole Church." They claimed, also, that the Holy Spirit indorsed it.

We have before seen no evidence that these men, who disturbed the peace at Antioch, were sent out by the Church at Jerusalem for that purpose. The Council takes occasion expressly to disavow it—to whom we gave no such commandment, say they.

The influence of time, party spirit, their personal association with Jewish believers, and a natural tendency of age to return to early opinions, however, have yet to exert their power upon them. It is known that early associations and national feelings so powerfully drew upon the heart of Paul himself that, in old age, as the time of the Passover drew near, he said, "I must keep this feast also." If it were so with the author of Romans and Galatians, what was it with those who had been comparatively aloof from the battle? We know this, that upon Paul's arrival in Jerusalem to attend this feast, having refreshed himself with a night's rest, he appeared before James and the elders, and gave a long account of his success and manners among the Gentiles. We know what these had been. He had unflinchingly defended the liberty of the Gentiles, and had magnanimously allowed the Jews the same liberty on these questions. When James and the elders heard this, "they

glorified the Lord;" but told him that a rumor had been circulated to his prejudice—doubtless by those Jews of Asia, who, at the end of the week, stirred up the mob—that he had taught the Jews who were among the Gentiles, that "they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk in the customs." They do not blame him for teaching that the Gentiles are free; they expressly remind him that "it was written and concluded that they should bind on the Gentile no such thing." They do not blame him for teaching that the law is of no force; they seem to imply that no one would care for that. They simply tell him, that it is rumored that he had gone farther, had been unfaithful to the compact at Jerusalem, and had forbidden the Jew to keep the law, who was to be as free as the Gentile on this subject. They, themselves, profess not to believe the report, but advise Paul to counteract the slanders of these Asiatic Jews. In this instance, James—who is the only apostle mentioned—manifests a zealous faithfulness to the original agreement. This is all we have from Luke. It is thought by some that Luke, being anxious to have it appear that Paul was in harmony with others, puts the best possible statement of facts; and that Paul's letter to the Galatians puts them in quite another light. This letter refers to two occasions—the time when Paul "went up by revelation" to compare doctrines, and the time when certain came from James to Antioch. Concerning the first of these, we are able to get at the whole reason of the conference.

Paul had not had the advantage of the discourses of Jesus; was known not to have been one of the original apostles, and had not learned his Gospel from them. If he were following the inspiration of the Spirit, as he was sure he was, he knew himself to be right, whatever the others might teach; if they were inspired, both must agree. But Paul's field of labor differed from theirs in this: According to the liberty allowed by all, the others were in the midst of a homogeneous community of Jews, and there was no necessity laid upon them to make any issue. Paul was among Gentiles mainly, but many Jews also. The issue must be made. These Jews, being apart from those of Judea, would not well understand that the observance of the law which they found there was a mere thing of toleration by the apostles. They would naturally infer a difference of teaching. They misrepresented Paul to James;

they also misrepresented James to Paul. Siding, themselves, with the law, they pronounced Paul an impostor. Paul and the others might not believe the reports concerning each other, still there must have been a mutual desire for reliable information. Moreover, besides satisfying himself, it would give the means of shutting the mouths of these opposers. A feeling of this kind—prompted, as he says, by the Spirit, who had future history in mind—led Paul to go up to Jerusalem, in order to compare doctrines and ordinances. The result was—according to the single account by Paul himself—they found perfect harmony in their view of the Gospel. They also agreed each to go on in their respective fields without further anxiety about each other. The attempt in this age to make out a schism among the apostles, justifies the wisdom of the Spirit in prompting Paul to this journey. It is a fact of great significance, also, to the question of the inspiration of these men, that, while following what they deemed the impulse of the Spirit, they, without concert, and in fields remote, are found preaching the same Gospel, and “delivering” the same ordinances.

The other reference in Galatians is to the men who came from James. It is said that Paul means to imply that the circumstances reported to him of the state of Galatian Churches, justify the suspicion of bad faith on the part of the College at Jerusalem. It is not apparent from Paul's language that these men were sent by James to teach Judaism, much less to interfere with the authority of Paul. The passage would corroborate other evidence, if there were any—which there is not—but proves nothing of itself; and, in the face of abundant evidence that Paul and James were not at variance, it must receive another interpretation.

There is still further evidence that, at the time of the writing of this letter, there was no breach between these two men. The letter was written previous to that last visit to Jerusalem, when he was informed of the slanders of the Asiatic Jews. The latest date assigned to the Epistle is the year 58—and that by very few—while most assign a much earlier date. The earliest time allowed to this visit is also 58; but by others it is supposed to be two years later. If, however, they belong to the same year; if, indeed, the letter was written at any time after the visit, Paul could not but have referred to it in the letter, since its bearing would be so direct and weighty

upon the subject under consideration. The supposed disruption is not placed before this visit; therefore there was none before, or at the time of, the letter; and Paul, as he does not say so, could not have implied it. Neither was this letter "a final and deliberate schism, as defiant as the Confession of Augsburg, and vastly more complete;" for at the time of this subsequent visit, they "receive him gladly," and address him as "brother."

There remain to be examined the letters of Peter, James, and Jude, with those allusions in the Apocalypse to insubordinate men and impostors. In the absence of any proof of such feeling toward Paul, it is most gratuitous to construe them to mean him. If one so strong and prominent as Paul is alluded to, especially if, as we are told, they set up the claims of a hierarchy, we can not understand why they should attack him in this weak and cowardly manner, and not boldly name him out, and as boldly confront him. There is no reason for supposing that John and Jude do so, except that Peter and James do it; the similarity of the language suggesting the inference that they all allude to the same persons. It has already been seen that the historical statements do not warrant the suspicion that either Peter or James has done this. The letter of James denounces nobody; nor does it afford any hint that he was imbued with the narrow Jewish idea. On the contrary, Paul has written no sentence which, for broad and simple views, surpasses James's definition of pure and uncorrupted religion—to visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction, and to keep one's self unspotted from the world.

Peter severely denounces those who rebel against authorities, and places "the commandments of us, the apostles of the Lord and Savior," on a level with the prophetic Scriptures. But that these denunciations are not aimed at Paul, and that he does not set up an apostolical claim over him, is certain from the fact that, in the same letter in which these are found, he speaks of him as "our beloved brother Paul," and mentions "all his Epistles" side by side with "the other Scriptures" which can only do harm, as the others, by being "wrested" from their fair meaning. Certain it is, these men claimed to be inspired—claimed it for themselves, and conceded it to one another; and are in harmony and without schism in the last authentic account we have of them. The claim of inspiration on the part of ordinary men, under ordinary circumstances, would demand proof.

We can not deny it to such as these, without invalidating the evidence that "God bore them witness with signs and wonders, and divers miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his will;" or by showing that they have taught, for revelation, doctrines which are incompatible.

The length of this article forbids the notice of other points which we would have liked to bring under examination.

III.—THE BASIS OF CHRISTIAN UNION.

CHRISTIAN Union can be effected only in one of two ways; either:

1. By bringing Christians into perfect agreement respecting the points which now divide them; or,
2. By practically ignoring those points, and uniting regardless of them.

The first way may be the more desirable, but at present it is manifestly impracticable. No one can rationally believe that the minds of all Christians can be brought, while sustaining the relations to each other and to their respective doctrinal systems which they now do, to entertain the same views, to approve and adopt the same practices, and to attach to this or that doctrine or ordinance precisely the same importance. Under different and more favorable circumstances, it is conceivable that much might be accomplished in this direction; but at present the work is effectually barred by the very condition of things which calls most loudly for its performance. The fact that Christians are now *separated*—that they do not stand *together*, so as to contemplate the Scriptures from the same point of vision—must, during the existence of this fact, prevent them from seeing alike, and cause them to view the same objects in different lights, shades, and relations. To one ecclesiastical knight the shield will present its golden, to another its silver, side. Each will be confident of the correctness of his own view; and happy for us if he be not ready to maintain it with sword and spear.

Good men must be true to their convictions. And when these convictions pertain to matters of grave importance—to the faith, the doctrines, the ordinances of religion—we may be sure that, for any possible benefits of union, they will not be renounced and disowned. The Baptist, in conscientiously differing from the Presbyterian, and in earnestly maintaining his view, should not, therefore, be classed by the latter as a bigot, but should be esteemed as an honest, faithful, and true man. The Presbyterian, in like manner, should be credited by the Baptist with the same virtues, and honored for his fidelity to his own profound sense of what is true and right. So of every man of every sect. The plan of union which would require him to be false to his conscience, faithless to his trust, and regardless of what is to him the teaching of the Bible, can merit no respect, and should receive no favor.

Certainly, it is proper for all to be exhorted to a faithful self-examination, in order to detect and remove their prejudices; but even when this work shall have been done, there will still remain a long list of items about which the best and wisest will conscientiously differ—items so important that a scrupulous fidelity will refuse, as it ought, to abandon them.

The reader has but to look into his own heart, to find there the precious treasures which nothing could induce *him* to give up. Let him know that the possessions of every other man—assuredly of every *true* man—are to him equally sacred and inalienable.

It follows, therefore, that if the great work of the age is to be prosecuted with the faintest hope of success, we may as well abandon, at once and forever, the idea of accomplishing it by means of *an antecedent agreement on particulars*. As a *consequent* of Christian union, agreement *may* be reached; AS ITS ANTECEDENT, NEVER.

In the light of this truth, it is obvious that the advocates of Christian Union—and they are happily becoming very numerous and earnest—are but beating the air, so long as their blows are aimed at mere denominational mistakes and errors, real or imaginary. Whatever their immediate success may be, there is no permanent result. The cause of such mistakes being immanent and active, new errors spring up as rapidly as the old are demolished; and hence there is a perpetual advance without any progress. The foundation sinks as fast as the superstructure is reared. And ages of such labor would

but serve to illustrate the truth here stated, that no amount of depreciation, no degree of zeal, no quality of desire, no cost of sacrifice, can bring men to see alike, so long as they occupy different positions, and look through different media.

But what then? Shall we regard the union of Christians as an impracticable dream? as an intangible vision that is forever to elude our grasp? Is there no way by which all the people of God can be *brought* to see eye to eye, and to be of the same mind and judgment? Possibly there is none. Yet we are glad that the Churches do not believe so. They are seeking to find this way, and there is much to encourage the hope of final and speedy success.

The alternative plan suggested in the beginning of this article—namely, the practical ignoring of the various points upon which the Churches differ—while it is believed to indicate the *direction* in which Christian union is to be sought, is not presented as covering the whole ground which the subject opens up. Nor is it claimed that this plan is free from objections. They will, no doubt, spring up in formidable array before the mind of the reader, whether he seeks to contemplate such a union as completed, or to conceive it in process of formation. To one, it will suggest the breaking down of the bulwarks of truth; to another, the necessity of fellowshiping error; to another still, the virtual abandonment of his most cherished beliefs and practices. But in reply to all of these objections, whether they be well or ill founded, it is simply insisted that the Christian public, with singular unanimity, and the Christian Scriptures, with unambiguous explicitness, alike demand Christian union as a right and duty; and this union it is morally impossible to effect upon any other plan. If we *can not agree*, and are yet bound to *unite*, our union must be formed irrespective of our differences. Be the objections, then, what they may, the man that can not devise a means of bringing Christians to the adoption of the same views, doctrines, and practices, must abandon the advocacy of Christian union as a practicable thing, or else consent to accept the only remaining plan by which it may possibly or conceivably be brought about.

But it should be understood that, by the very terms of this plan, no truth would be sacrificed. It is not denied that it would be brought into new relations; it might be placed in more immediate contact with error; it might find access to new congregations, and be

proclaimed from pulpits that would else never hear it; but no one would be required to abandon or to compromise it. The danger to be apprehended, then, from such a state of things, surely does not threaten the truth nor the interests of those who hold it. The consciously weak—those who distrust their cause, who would fear to see their principles placed side by side with others—these may prudently hesitate. But for those who wish for nothing so much as a fair and impartial investigation of their belief—and that, too, under circumstances favorable to a candid consideration of its proofs and its merits—the case is entirely different, and the risks none at all.

Again, it should be observed, that while this plan contemplates the practical ignoring of points of difference as elements in the contemplated union, it implies the recognition and adoption of some unifying principle; that is, some truth which is not only common to all, but which, at the same time, is fundamental in the conception of all. In other words, union can not be consummated *merely* by "agreeing to disagree." There must be a basis of unanimous faith, upon which the united Church is to stand—some capital, cardinal, radical article upon which all agree. Hitherto this has not been decided upon; and hence the tendency toward union, and the earnest efforts which quite recent times have witnessed, to effect it, have resulted in but meager success. The desire for it has been awakened and intensified; the sense of Christian obligation respecting it has been quickened; it is looked and longed and prayed for; men are ready to make sacrifices for it,—but still it comes not. A few subdivisions of minor sects have been healed; many excellent articles commendatory of these results, and calling for an extension of the work, have been written; wider charities have come into activity, as witnessed in the more frequent and hearty, the more unconstrained and unembarrassed, co-operation of Churches and ministers of different denominations,—all of which betoken a profound dissatisfaction with the existing state of division, and are prophetic of a change. They point to a readjustment of ecclesiastical relations; and, viewed merely *as* signs and tokens, they are important and valuable. But let us not mistake them for the thing signified. They indicate that a truce has been declared; but there is yet no peace. A parley has been sounded, but no treaty has been signed. The demand of the age is not satisfied; the debt is acknowledged, but it is not paid.

It may safely be said, however, that the case has reached a stage where it is proper to propose and discuss *terms*—to submit a *basis* of settlement; and what is desiderated, is such a basis as shall satisfy the legitimate claims and preserve the essential rights of all parties.

In offering our humble contribution to this most worthy object, we respectfully submit that the organic truth or statement of belief which is to serve the purpose indicated, must be characterized:

1. *By simplicity, both in terms and in subject-matter.* It might be possible to frame a statement in words so ambiguous that all, with one or another private interpretation, would be willing to accept it. But such a proposition, so far from serving the purpose of union, would only become the parent of endless strife and debate. We should gain nothing by coming together upon a basis that could not *hold* us together. The organic truth, therefore, should be stated in terms the plainest and simplest possible—terms that, to all earnest and good men, such as the union contemplates, would convey, substantially, the same meaning.

It must also be free from complexity in its subject-matter; some radical truth, upon which no doctrinal tenet of any man or any party is grafted.

2. *By comprehensiveness.* That is, as embracing and infolding all essential truth. The artificial prominence which sectarian contests have given to secondary truths, exposes us to the danger of settling upon some one or more of these as primary and radical. For example, the prolonged strife with Romanism on the one hand, and with Unitarianism on the other, incline many to fix upon what are called the orthodox doctrines of Protestantism as the fundamental truth. By the force of education, these doctrines have come to be regarded as strictly germinal; whereas, in fact, they are the outgrowth of a truth which precedes them in statement, and which, in every individual case, is antecedently accepted. In other words, they are dependent truths, upheld by an *underlying basis*; and, as such, they are unsuited to the purpose in view.

3. *By catholicity.* By this we mean that the fundamental proposition must be one which *all Christians*, of whatever name or peculiarity, *unqualifiedly accept*. This will be evident upon considering the precise object of the union movement. What is this object?

It is not to argue men into the adoption of a better system of doctrines; it is not to wage war upon denominational mistakes; it is not to set the Methodist right upon this point, and the Baptist upon that; but it is to bring *recognized Christians* into fellowship and co-operation. Hence, the principle that shall accomplish this must, of necessity, be one already approved and embraced by them. How prone we are to forget this! How ready to defeat this grand object by perverting its argument and motive to proselyting purposes! If we can but have "our views" embraced in the foundation, our favorite doctrines acknowledged, our denominational differentia catholicized! How few of us are able to subordinate our partisan predilections to the general good! The truth is, while ostensibly advocating union, and fancying really that we are faithful to the cause, many of us are thus actually promoting and perpetuating division.

4. *By practical importance.* Any speculative proposition, though it might satisfy the requirements already mentioned, would necessarily fail from its lack of centripetal force. Nothing can permanently command the respect or control the relations of men which does not affect their life. Finally,

5. *By Divine authority.* It were the merest folly to anticipate the bringing of Christ's people together by any save his own Word. A stranger they will not follow; for they know not the voice of strangers. If this be true, as none can rationally doubt, we shall be obliged to turn from every partisan creed, excellent and valuable in some respects as many of them are, and seek our basis elsewhere. And not only must we pass from every *partisan* creed, but also from those ancient symbols which, in a sense, are the common property of us all.

Let us mention, for example, the so-called Apostles' Creed—unquestionably the best of its kind, and the one most generally believed and accepted. It has even been proposed and advocated quite recently as the basis of Christian union; a position for which, in some respects, it is admirably adapted. It is in the main simple in terms, comprehensive in scope, catholic in the extent of its acceptance, and practical in its bearings. It is not perfect, certainly, in these respects, but still it is wanting in but few essentials. These few, however, are believed to be fatal to its claims. In the first place (and upon reflection this will be seen to be a capital objection), it is

a *product* of Christianity, and not, in *propria forma*, the germ from which Christianity itself was developed. In the second place, it is open to the charge of complexity and confusion in its subject-matter. Why, for instance, should belief "in the Holy Catholic Church," in whatever sense the terms may be understood, be associated and placed upon a level with belief in God the Father and in Jesus Christ his Son? Are both items equally essential to salvation? Are both equally fundamental? Or is there not here a blending of the basis with the superstructure? of the primary with the secondary? of the cause with the effect? Again, it is pertinent to inquire whether the *subjective* faith in these two items is the same? Do we believe in the Holy Catholic Church in the *same way*, with the same deference and trustfulness, that we believe in Christ? Surely, we do not; and if not, there is a commingling of elements in this creed which, whether regarded objectively or subjectively, causes it to exhibit confusion and complication.

Again, it is certainly conceivable that a man might be an acceptable Christian without believing that Christ "descended into hell;" at any rate, without believing it in "our" sense of these terms. This is hermeneutical and debatable ground. It opens a question; it invites controversy; it leads to variation, perchance to division. Great parties have been formed, and great interests jeopardized, upon points of far less moment. When, in addition to all this, and much more that might be said in the same line, it is remembered that this venerable creed is still human, the reader will perceive, heartily and unreservedly as he may himself believe it, that it is not such a basis as we need. And if this, the most venerable, the simplest, the best of all human creeds, will not answer, it is useless to search further in this direction.

We turn, then, to the Divine formula, the Confession of the Faith, given originally in the language of Peter: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Or, for the sake of expressing it in the third person: "JESUS OF NAZARETH IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD."

It were easy to show from Scripture and history, as well as by an analysis of its terms, that this proposition satisfies, fully and perfectly, all the requirements of the case. We have space for only brief and suggestive allusions:

1. Every one must admire the wisdom which could express so profound a truth in terms at once so brief and so plain. We look in vain for a deficiency, a redundancy, or an ambiguity. Certainly, we do not pretend that the truth stated is shallow—so shallow that all, or that any, can fathom it. On the contrary, it reaches down into the depths of the Divine nature, and involves the inscrutable mystery of the Divine Incarnation. But we mean that this Confession, albeit employing unknown, and even unknowable, quantities, is grammatically and verbally simple. It expresses *facts*. It expresses them in plain language—language that all may understand and rest in, notwithstanding the mysteries that may inhere in the subject-matter. Other *truths*, simpler and plainer, might be *announced*; but upon the supposition that the person and nature, the offices and relations, of Jesus Christ were necessary to be known and believed, and to be embodied in a formula for confession, it is not conceivable that *these truths* could be more happily or more intelligibly expressed. Moreover, this Confession is limited to one single subject, and directs the mind and the heart to one single object. It exhibits no multiplication of points, no incongruous elements, no straining to cover the whole ground; no glance, direct or indirect, at heresy and false doctrine; but, in simple majesty and dignity, it expresses the one only essential confessional truth, and leaves it alone.

2. It is not less wonderful, in view of its all-embracing comprehensiveness—covering, as it does, the entire field of revelation, and involving especially the whole foundation and work of redemption. It brings distinctly before us, in the first place, the *historical* “Jesus of Nazareth,” expressing thus belief in his incarnation, his wonderful works, his sorrowful life, his shameful death, his glorious resurrection and ascension. Then, this personage is believed to be *the Christ*, the One that was to come from God; the Divinely anointed Prophet, Priest, and King. He is, therefore, confided in as the Teacher of absolute truth, whose word is final, conclusive, and perfect; as the Priest, whose sacrifice for sins was infinitely meritorious and efficacious; and as the King, whose sole authority is to rule the life and fix the destiny of men. Hence, the term “Christ,” as applied to him, comprehends all that he taught, all that he did, and all that he requires. At the same time, and by the force of the same term, it excludes all other prophets, priests, and kings: none may speak,

officiate, or rule, except in subordination to Him. And, finally, all this is justified to reason and to faith by the fact that he is the "Son of God."

3. It is next to be noted that, though some have departed, in practice, from the life which this confessional truth contemplates, no party or sect in any age or clime, claiming to be Christian, has ever denied it. As if by common and universal consent, it is conceded that no man can *be* a Christian who does not believe it. Its absolute and most singular essentiality has caused, as it accounts for, its universal acceptance. It is the one proposition of which it may truly be said, that it has been believed *every-where, always, and by all*.

4. It is intimately associated with the regeneration and the life of the Christian. Every part of his religious experience and career is affected by it. His faith and patience, his prayers and praises, his hope and love, his self-denial and good works,—all of these find their significance and their va'ue in the fact which this Confession declares; and they would be meaningless and profitless if it were false. It is therefore of pre-eminent, practical importance.

5. It is Divine. God, the Father, revealed it; Jesus Christ, the Son, approved it; the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, inspired and taught it. Nor is this all—for this, indeed, might be said of any truth in the Bible—but the Confession thus authoritatively taught, thus Divine in substance and in terms, is *expressly declared to be the foundation of Christ's Church*; and, if so, certainly of that Church in its most perfect union. In view, then, of every proper consideration, it is seen to be the very basis desiderated, and, we may safely believe, the only one possible.

We can not pause to show that this proposition formed, in the Apostolic Age, the issue between the Church and the world. It is the same to-day; and to the end of time it must continue to constitute the ground upon which every offensive and defensive struggle shall be made. It is here, too, that the individual soul finds the basis of its hopes and the inspiration of its life. The complete and hearty acceptance of this truth, with all its wonderful comprehensiveness of meaning, and its multiplied practical consequences, *makes the Christian*. Then, it gives him the Bible. It authenticates for him every word. It points out his duty and his trust, inspires his

hope, kindles his love, and furnishes him for all trial and all work. Here, then, upon the Rock, and only here, we may hope to build. Let Christ, and not a sect; Christ, and not a formula of doctrine; be the center toward which all his people shall tend, and around which they shall gather lovingly together. Thus the great eternal purpose of infinite love and wisdom will be realized, when he shall have "gathered together *in one*, all things *in Christ*."

It would be germane to the general subject for us to point out, here and now, the principle that should regulate the intercourse and relations of the united Church; but limited space forbids more than a bare announcement of the fact that, from the nature of the case, regard must be had chiefly, if not exclusively, to Christian conduct. Let this be the test of Christian standing, the condition of continued fellowship, and we may well leave our speculative differences to the healing influence of a correct principle, and the salutary power of brotherly love.

IV.—WUTTKE ON THE IRRATIONALITY OF SIN.*

FROM man's freedom of will, over against the moral law, there follows the possibility that he may decline to will and to do the good. This possibility is morally overcome only at the goal of the moral development, in the state of perfected holiness; but during the development itself, while man has not as yet, morally, fully merged himself into life-communion with God, it remains possible for him to break off this development, and to turn away from communion with God. The conscious non-willing of the good—that is, the opposing of one's own will to the Divine will—is *sin*. The idea of sin is therefore, primarily, a negating one; it is a negating of the morally good, an opposition to God's law, a revolting from the Divine will. But as the spiritual life is a continuous one, and at no moment merely negative, but must always have a positive content, hence sin must have such also. As the non-willing of the godly sin is directly, also, a willing of the ungodly; and inasmuch as all

* From Wuttke's "Christliche Ethik" (Christian Ethics).

reality, sin excepted, is harmonious with the Divine will; so is sin essentially a destroying of the good reality, and hence, also, a forming of an ungodly reality.

The ungodly is not extant in the original creation, even as a germ or dormant capacity; that is, sin, though arising from and through the creature, yet has in the creature not its sufficient *ground*, but only its *possibility*. Neither the *sensuous* phase of man, nor any phase or quality of his *spirit*, is the sufficient ante-moral ground of sin, in such a sense as there is for the good an ante-moral ground. Every assumption of a sufficient ground for sin in the original essence of the creature—that is, the assumption of the *necessity* of sin—makes God its author, and thereby cancels its very idea, seeing God can never do any thing ungodly. The reality of sin can be cognized only as a *fact*; that is, historically, but not philosophically.

At this point the Christian and the naturalistic theories come into conflict, and every reconciliation of them works only confusion. The question to be decided here is, whether God, as well as also man, is to be regarded as rational spirit, *or* as nature. Its assumption of a real foundation of sin in the essence of man—that is, of the necessity of sin as a legitimate development stage of humanity, a necessary transition stage of the soul-life—excludes the notion of a personal God, as also that of the true personality of man, and belongs only to the pantheistical world-theory, according to which man is absolutely determined in his whole being and life by the necessity-bound, self-developing, or eternally on-circulating life of the All. The thought of the necessity of sin is approximatively present already in Erigena; but is fully carried out by Spinoza, and in all the branches of recent philosophy dependent on him. The conceiving of *all* reality as rational, as necessary—that is, the effort rationally to *comprehend* all reality—leads to the canceling of the essence of sin itself.

In the general moral consciousness, also, of all heathen nations, sin is something which absolutely *should not* be, and not merely something which, after a period of legitimate existence, is to be overcome. When men speak of sin, they never mean a temporarily legitimately existing *lack*, but something which has no right to exist, even for a moment. Hence, to explain sin as a something which has a merely transitory legitimacy, is to substitute an entirely

different idea for the one contained in the unquestionably universal moral consciousness. Between the notion of a mere lack and that of sin, there is an essential difference. The former awakens only an effort to advance further; the latter awakens moral abhorrence. He who embraces sin, in general, as only a transient lack, and finds it grounded in a natural defectiveness, must also have the courage to declare the single sins—such as assassination, adultery, perjury, Judas's treachery—as sufficiently grounded and necessary. But there is no advocate of this doctrine who does not find, at least in others, qualities and actions which he despises, hates, and abhors. Now, if the naturalistic view of sin is correct, there can not, at all, be any such qualities and actions; and there would only remain to be settled the question, how the (according to this view) foolish general conviction of the punishableness of crimes and sins is to be reconciled with the presupposition of the rationality of all reality. If every thing evil is realized through inner necessity, and hence truly not evil at all, then the judgment in the general moral consciousness, as to the punishableness of the same and the actual punishing of it, is absurd and unjust, and hence really evil itself. From this dilemma there is no escape. The naturalistic world-theory, which undertakes to eliminate every thing irrational from reality, brands thereby the collective moral consciousness of humanity as irrational. When Hegel designates the sin-fall as the progress of the rational spirit beyond its original spiritual obtusity; when Daub calls it the humanization of the brute; and when Strauss, in harmony therewith, regards "the transition of the will through evil" as "inseparable from the notion of the world and of human nature,"—this is in perfect harmony with the presuppositions of their systems, although they do not go on and draw the further conclusions which are unavoidably involved. But when, also, *Rothe*, under the influence of this philosophy, takes the position that the moral development of the human race can not be primarily a *normal* one, but *must* be at first an "*abnormal*" one before it becomes normal—in other words, that God has not only permitted evil in humanity, but has also really *willed* it as absolutely necessary—while yet this abnormality itself remains damnable and morally to be abhorred,—he does not thereby bring the pantheistic thought nearer to the Christian consciousness; but, in fact, utterly bewilders it before the logical understanding.

That any thing which is necessary, in virtue of the Divine world-plan, can be "abnormal," is a thought which, surely, itself can not be altogether "normal."

In the moral notion of sin, it is implied that sin has *not* a sufficient ground in the nature of the rational creature, and hence that it is *not* at all to be comprehended rationally—that is, as necessary—but only to be embraced as a fact. Only that which is rational can be comprehended rationally; but sin is irrational. Only the possibility of sin, as the expression of will-freedom, can be comprehended rationally; but not its reality. Hence, we are at once to reject, as contrary to the very idea of sin, all those attempts at explaining the origin of sin which, going beyond this possibility, seek for any kind of *ground* for the sin-fall; and it is at least inconsiderate and a forgetting of what is necessarily implied thereby, when even theological dogmatists and ethicists attempt such explanations. God is not a tempter to evil; he tempts no one (James i, 13); but God *would* be the tempter if, in the primitive nature of man, he had laid even a propension to evil. Every propension which incites and entices man is, of itself, sinful already—that is, contrary to God—and can not, therefore, lie in the primitive nature of man itself. Whatever comes from God is absolutely and necessarily *good* (James i, 13-17); for "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all" (1 John i, 5); and hence, also there comes none *from* him. All sin is hostility to God. Now, God can not awaken hostility to himself. The father of lies and of sin among men is, according to Scripture, not God, but the devil. (John viii, 44; 1 John iii, 8, 12; Mat. xiii, 39.) More strongly than this could hardly be expressed the antagonism of the Christian view to the above favorite pantheistic view of the day. The words, "It *repented* the Lord that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart" (Gen. vi, 6), clearly imply that all evil is absolutely contradictory to the Divine creative will. According to the favorite modern view, it would have to read, "It rejoiced God that Adam and Eve proceeded to develop themselves in harmony with their original constitution."

In the light of the Christian consciousness, therefore, it is clearly settled that God is in no sense whatever the ground or originator of evil, and that evil is not merely an antithesis of the good which a higher unity harmonizes (which would be a direct contradiction), but

that it stands to the good in an absolutely irreconcilable antagonism; and however Calvinistic predestinarianism presents the fall as embraced in the unconditional predestination of God, still even the most rigid presentations of this system definitely disavow the thought that God is the active *ground* of the fall, however little this disavowal is justified by the system itself. The thought that there is for sin in the original nature of man no actual ground, stands intimately connected with the notions of God's holiness and of man's freedom of will.

Those who, in opposition to the general Christian view, seek the ground of sin in the original nature of man, place it either in a mere *lack* or defect of this nature, or in a real germ of evil. The first view, according to which the natural limitedness of the creature occasions also an uncertainty of knowledge, and in virtue of this, also, an erring course of volitionating and acting—so that there lies in man not indeed a *causa efficiens mali*, but a *causa deficiens*, a non-presence of the truth—fails entirely to explain the origin of sin; for a *per se* legitimate mere non-presence, or a not-yet presence of a quality, leads in itself not to evil, but rather to a striving after higher perfection; that is, to the good itself. Moreover, if defectiveness were the ground of sin, then the degree of the limitedness would be also the degree of the evil, or at least of the temptation to evil; the brute would be more evil than man. In fact, however, the possibility of the greater sin rises with the perfection of the original endowments; and only the most perfect creatures can commit the highest sins. Greater limitedness is rather a protection against evil than a ground for it. Children are less sinful than adults. Sin does not sink with the rise of spiritual and bodily power, but usually increases; the greatest crimes are committed by the highly gifted, and riches are more dangerous than poverty. The Lord counts happy those who are spiritually poor, who recognize their limitations. It is utterly erroneous to make limitedness the direct antithesis of perfection; the limitations of finite creatures are a part of their specific perfections. It is not a defect of the nightingale that it is smaller than the swan, nor of the child that it has yet before it a long development course; every created being is perfect *in its kind*. It is the *perfection* of man that he has the possibility of a progressive development. But from such a limitedness, as inhering in the perfection of every creature, there can never spring

any thing necessarily evil. Moreover, if the real ground of evil lies in the natural limitedness of the creature, then this would not be merely a transiently legitimate transition-stage; but inasmuch as the limitedness of the creature will never be transcended, hence, also, evil would have to continue to all eternity. In any case, therefore, this theory destroys both the notion and the essence of sin.

Those who assume a *real* (positive) ground for evil in human nature, place it either in self-love or in sensuousness, or in both together.

1. *Self-love* is regarded as the ground of sin, in so far as it has a tendency to act in isolated independence over against God and the rest of the universe. This view conflicts both with the nature of the human spirit and with the Christian notion of creation. Self-love is an activity necessarily inherent in all living creatures, and is therefore, *per se*, good, and has nothing in it which could be regarded as a real germ of evil. It is even a part of the God-likeness of the creature; for God loves himself, and man *ought* to love himself. The undeniable force of this observation is sought to be averted by saying that not self-love *per se*, but a too high *degree* of it, is the ground of sin. This, however, does not remove the contradiction; for a *too high* degree—that is, a degree of self-love contradictory to the Divine creative will—can obviously not be *innate* in man. And if this is not the case, then the question recurs anew, How does man come into this contradiction with his original goodness? The sinfulness of self-love is not in its degree, but in its quality. If man is to love God with his whole heart, mind, and strength, and his neighbor *as himself* (Matt. xxii, 37, sq.); if he is to love his neighbor with his whole heart, that is, as much as he can; and if self-love appears here as the measure of neighborly love,—then the Christian is to love also *himself* with his whole heart, that is, as much as he can. This high self-love verifies itself in the legitimate striving after personal perfection; and in *this* respect certainly there is no possibility of an excess. But if the sinful excess is said to be in the preponderation of self-love over the love to God (which we cheerfully admit), still it does not at all appear that self-love itself contains more than the *possibility* of such an abnormalcy, but not a real *ground* for it. For the love to God does not in the least exclude self-love, but in fact requires it; and the sinful reversal of relation consists not so much in that the person

loves himself *too much*, as rather in that he loves God *too little*. The more a person loves God, so much the more loves he truly himself; and the more he truly loves himself, so much the more he loves God. Hence, not an excess, but a *lack*, of true love is the ground of all subsequent sins; and this lack is already itself sinful, and hence can not serve as an adequate explanation of sin in general: it only pushes the question of the ground of sin one stage further back. The question as to the *ground* of sin must not be interchanged with that as to the *first* sin.

2. More prevalent still is the view that the natural and adequate ground of sin is the *sensuousness* which predominates in man so long as he has not attained to full development; thus most of the Rationalists and, most ingeniously, Schleiermacher. The ground of sin, in this view, lies in the essential duality of the corporeal and the spiritual natures in man, in that in the earlier life-stages the sensuous element (the lower propensions) naturally gets the start of the slower-developing reason, a preponderancy over the God-consciousness; yielding to the sensuous inclination, man sins. Appeal is here made especially to the antithesis of "*flesh*" and "*spirit*," so common in Scripture, where the former is taken as the sensuously-somatic phase of man, and the latter as his reason. This view is foreign both to the Scriptures and to the early Church, and was refuted by the Church in its contests with the Gnostic and Manichæan heresies. Augustine clearly shows its one-sidedness, and the Church of the Reformation condemns it; and this with good reasons, for: 1. A relation lying in the primitive nature of man can be neither evil nor the ground for any thing evil; such a ground would be itself evil. The predominancy of the sensuously-corporeal life in early childhood is ordained of God himself, and is simply a limitedness subsequently to be overcome; but in no sense whatever an evil, no more than the brute is evil because of the predominancy of the sensuous life in it. And that sensuousness *per se* antagonizes the rational spirit, is an idle fiction, and utterly inconceivable in the uncorrupted creation of God. 2. In this view, the immature child would have to be more sinful than the grown man; but, in the universal moral judgment, children are the least sinful of all—a symbol of innocence—and, therefore, presented by Christ as a pattern even for his disciples; whereas the greatest moral ruthlessness is manifested in those life-stages where

the spirit has already full power over the sensuous nature. Also; on this hypothesis, the degree of sinfulness would depend upon the degree of the violence of the sensuous nature, and sin would naturally decline with the decrease of sensuousness; whereas general experience teaches that youth rises much more frequently to noble sentiments than narrow-hearted, selfish old age. 3. This hypothesis accounts for only a very small—and that, too, the least important—class of sins, and leaves spiritual sins entirely unexplained. Anger, envy, jealousy, falsehood, slander, arrogance, ambition, etc., have nothing to do with sensuousness; nay, often even counteract sensuous proclivities. Sensuous sins reduce man to the character of the brute; whereas the sins of arrogance aim to exalt him above the limits set to him by God, and to give him the significance of a being independent of God; it is out of the *heart*, and not from the sensuous nature, that evil thoughts arise. (Matt. xv, 19, 20.) 4. While the sensuous nature may, on the one hand, impel toward various sins, yet, on the other hand, it incites to much good, and restrains from much evil. Sexual love, as springing from the sexual instinct, frequently counteracts covetousness, selfishness, revenge, etc. Hunger, and the desire for sensuous enjoyment, stimulate to industry. In general, the sensuous needs lead to activity, to union with others, and hence to sociality. The inclination to repose frequently hinders the execution of evil, and checks in many ways the full development of the sins or malice. The sensuous nature can not, therefore, at all be regarded as the ground of evil. 5. This view is irreconcilable with the thought of the sinlessness of Christ; for as Christ, in respect to his physical life, took upon himself the whole nature of man, and became therein like unto us,—hence, on this supposition, he must also have experienced, during his human development, the predominancy of sensuousness over reason, and thus have been led to sin. But if the natural predominancy of the sensuous over the spiritual in Christ, during his childhood, was neither evil nor the ground of evil, then the same must hold good also of man in his primitive state. 6. This view is directly contrary to the Biblical doctrine of the nature and significance of the sensuously-somatic life. The Scriptures do not derive sin from sensuousness, but give it an essentially spiritual origin. It is not so much sensuous desire which brings Eve to her fall, as rather the illegitimate presumption excited by the idea that

the tree would make her *wise*. Falsehood is the essence of sin, both in men and in angels; and falsehood belongs to the sphere of spirit, and not of sensuousness. The "flesh" which appears, especially in St. Paul, opposed to the "spirit," as the seat of sin, is by no means the primitive sensuous nature of man, but simply this nature as already depraved by sin; and is not the first cause, but, in fact, a product of sin. This "flesh" belongs, in its moral significance, primarily and chiefly to the spiritual life, and only secondarily to the sensuous. The sensuous nature, even in depraved man, is not the seat proper of sin, but is only drawn over into corruption by the sinfully perverted spirit. The "flesh" is sin, as having become a second nature, and as appearing under an unfree and unfree-making nature-character; and it is simply because unfreedom is the antipode of the spirit, that the sinful nature of man is called "flesh." When the "flesh" is taken in a moral sense, its "works" appear by no means as merely sensuous sins, but largely, also, as purely spiritual sins, which are not only not stimulated by sensuousness, but, on the contrary, in many ways checked; such as unbelief, impiety, quarrelsomeness, envy, bigotry, hatred. The expressions, *to live, to be, to walk after the flesh*, uniformly designate the collective, sinful, unspiritual life, as in contradistinction to the life in the spirit; and in this connection the word "spirit" never signifies the natural reason, but rather the Holy Spirit, and the human spirit as by it regenerated and sanctified. "To live after the natural spirit" in its state of non-communion with God, through Christ, never constitutes an antithesis to "walking in the flesh," but is, in fact, this very walking itself. Hence, we read also of a "fleshly" wisdom; and St. Paul designates anti-sensuous, self-imposed mortification by fasting, etc., as a presumption of the fleshly mind. (Col. ii, 18.) Christ's utterance to Peter, "The Spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak," can not be referred to merely bodily weakness, but must relate mainly to Peter's fear of man.

That the corporeal nature, *per se*, is not the antithesis of the good, and the seat of sin, appears even from this, that it is called in the Scriptures the "temple of the Holy Ghost," as the earthly organ designed for Divine service. And Paul himself, to whom is ascribed this notion of the body as the ground of sin, lays special stress upon the resurrection of the body as the permanent organ of the immortal

spirit. The "flesh" is, therefore, unquestionably the very same as the "sinful, foolish heart." (Rom. i, 21.)

The entire view here opposed, is based on a dualism which was already overcome by the ancient Church; and while Rationalism utterly rejects the doctrine of a natural depravity resting upon a *historical* ground, it yet teaches a depravity on the basis of *creation*. That which the Church doctrine lays to the guilt of man, Rationalism charges upon God himself; but a holy, loving God could not have created man under the fetters of such a reason-enslaving sensuous nature. But if it should be urged that the merit of virtue is heightened by this preponderation of the sensuous, then consistency would require that a similar hinderance be sought and found as a test for the holiness of the angels: otherwise human virtue would be of a higher quality than theirs, and it would require not only sin in general, but also crimes, to be regarded as necessary; because their reality in humanity renders virtue more difficult, and hence more meritorious.

If Pelagianism could accuse the Church doctrine of natural depravity, with a tendency to discourage moral effort, certainly this apprehension may be excited in a still higher degree by the view that the original corporeal nature of man is the living fountain of sin; for the conviction is almost ineradicable that man, in following the inclinations implanted in him by God himself, can not be doing evil. And, unquestionably, if this theory be true, the noblest and purest form of the moral life would be the rigorous mortification of every sensuous impulse in monkish self-torture, but not a Christianly free, evangelical morality. But that such an ascetic hostility to all sensuous life is only a dangerous self-delusion, and that while in its fond belief of having destroyed the roots of sin, it yet continues to nourish the chief root of the same, the pride of the heart,—this the evangelical Church has clearly and unhesitatingly taught from the beginning.

3. The combination of *both* of the above-discussed sources of sin, self-love, and sensuousness (Baumgarten-Crusius, and similarly Rothe), does not remove the objections urged against each of the views; on the contrary, it rather strengthens them, by destroying the unity of view. According to this view, the essence and the notion of sin would be destitute of all inner unity; the result would be

simply two forcibly associated things, inappropriately designated by the same name, sin.

We must consequently recognize, with the collective Christian Church, that the ground of sin does not, in any way, lie in the original nature of man himself; that in general there can not be a *rational*—that is, a rationally to-be-comprehended—ground for sin; but that this cause is simply an irrational and, as such, incomprehensible determination of will. The historical character of the Christian world-view presupposes, also, a *historical*—that is, *spiritual*—origin of sin, which is realized by free act, and not by inner necessary nature-impulse. Every other explanation of sin is, in its very nature, naturalistic.

V.—CHURCH ORGANIZATION *VERSUS* CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

II.

IT will, we believe, be admitted by the intelligent reader, that none of the various forms in which the Church at present appears, approach very nearly, either in organization or in practical operation, to the original institution as it came directly from the hands of the apostles. It will not, perhaps, be so readily conceded that any of the principal functions of the Church have fallen into disuse, or are virtually abolished through the changes which have taken place. On the contrary, it is doubtless generally believed that all the functions which were of essential importance in the original ecclesiastical institution, are still in successful operation; that though the present methods may be different, yet, practically, the same ends are reached and the same work accomplished, and, indeed, in a manner better suited to the spirit of the times—the changes which have taken place having been, as it were, necessitated by the advance of civilization, and by changes and improvements in the condition of society.

On our part, we shall freely admit that, if all the essential functions of the Church are still successfully administered, then the

question of methods is really a matter of very little importance. But we are prepared to maintain that, in the present administration of Christianity, the proper, original, essential functions of the Church *are not* successfully discharged, and can not be, so long as the present system continues in force.

Among the functions of the Church which are of universal and perpetual importance, which are needed to-day, as at all other times, we may mention preaching, teaching—including prophecy—prayer and praise, the pastoral supervision of the membership, and attention to the wants of the suffering and needy. It will doubtless be readily admitted that all the duties here named, with perhaps the exception of prophecy, are still important and necessary. We commence the investigation with preaching—the very first condition of the success of the Gospel, and more than all the other functions of the Church representing her aggressive power. It will doubtless be said at once, that we certainly have enough of this, whatever else we may lack. We assert, on the contrary, that we have very little of it—so little, in fact, that there is the best reason to believe that the meaning of the word is not generally understood. We talk about “preaching sermons” and “preaching to Churches.” Now, a sermon can not be preached except by extolling and praising it as capable of accomplishing great results; and a Church is about the only place where the preaching of the Gospel is not needed. To preach the Gospel is to make known the glad tidings of salvation to the unbelieving and unconverted outside the Churches, to the end that they may believe, and obey, and be saved. The ordinary style of pulpit discourse is not preaching. These discourses may be excellent and admirable in their way—some of them confessedly are so—but they are not preaching; and no one would have thought of calling them so in the days when the Gospel was originally proclaimed, and no one has a right to call them so now.

Moreover, there is no occasion to preach the Gospel to the members of a Church. Christ has already been preached to them in one way or another, and they have heard and believed. They have come to the Church *because* they believe. Some persons come, doubtless, from other motives—to meet their friends, or because it is the fashion—but the great mass of the unbelieving are not well-dressed and respectable enough to do that, or have not the disposition to

do it. Now, preaching would be to go forth to these outside populations with the offers of eternal life; to make known the glad tidings of Christ and his salvation as presently applicable to them and their wants.

This may be done in their homes, in the thoroughfares, either singly or in crowds, wherever the opportunity may offer. Familiar personal conversation is often better for the purpose than a harangue. Paul speaks of his converts at Ephesus as those "*among whom he went about preaching the kingdom of God.*" All that is necessary is that the individual should believe the simple truths of the Gospel of Christ, and that, believing, he should determine to obey. He will then come to the Church, and join himself to the people of God.

Doubtless the idea so generally prevalent, that faith is not belief, but rather a psychological ferment, or a state of mind which can only thence be produced, that the individual must be got inside the doors of the Church and brought under the influence of an impassioned discourse in order to be converted, has much to do with our present methods of evangelization. But to refuse to preach the Gospel except inside the walls of a church, would seem to be taking a position very much like that of the farm-laborer, who, being found intoxicated under the fence by his employer, said, in reply to the remonstrances of the latter: "*If you want your potatoes dug, fetch them here.*" Why, the potatoes could not be brought to him without digging them first; and those who *need to hear the Gospel* can not generally be brought to the Churches to hear it. How shall they believe on Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear *except there be preaching?* And how shall they preach *except they be sent?* Sent where? Into a church-building to wait for the people to come, who generally will not come at all? No. Sent where the people are. That is the way to preach, and that is the meaning of preaching.

Those who come to the Church do not generally need preaching, but teaching; and, in fact, there is generally more teaching than preaching in the discourses of the ministers. But it is a most serious mistake to confound the two offices. The members of the Churches, many of them at least, are taught to believe that their ministers are called to preach; the ministers themselves generally believe that they are called to preach. There is good Scriptural authority

for believing in such a call; and there is a practical need both of preaching and of a call to indicate those whom the Lord would send forth to this work. The duty of teaching in the Church is more general, and does not depend on a special call. And if a man, believing that he is called by the Holy Spirit to preach the Gospel, does not go forth to his work, but remains in the Church as a teacher, why, the least that can be said is, that he has mistaken his calling. And the mistake is a most serious one; for to neglect the preaching of the Gospel, in the true sense of the terms *κηρύσσω, εὐαγγελίζομαι, καταγγέλλω*, is for the Church to lay aside its aggressive character, and to give over all direct and positive efforts to extend the conquests of the kingdom of Christ. All other means are indirect and comparatively inefficient.

Let it, then, be understood that, in the modern administration of Christianity, while there is a great deal that is called preaching, and thought to be preaching by those who do not understand the meaning of the term, we have, nevertheless, very little of the true preaching of the Gospel.

Teaching is the work next in order. Let us see how that is attended to. We may observe that teaching in the modern Church rests on a different basis from that which supported the same office in the Church of the apostolic period. The teachers of the Apostolic Church could teach only as they were taught by the apostles and primitive evangelists and by the Holy Spirit. The New Testament canon did not then exist. Now we have in permanent, reliable form, the substance both of the sayings of Christ and of the teachings of the apostles. The Holy Spirit is needful now, as then, to a correct apprehension of the truth, whether written or spoken, and is as surely promised and as freely accorded.

Now, it would be reasonable to expect that, with the Bible containing the whole system of Gospel truth in the hands of every Church member, so that all have the advantages which were then enjoyed but by the favored few, not only would accomplished Christian teachers be multiplied in the Churches, but the knowledge of Christian doctrine would be cultivated to a high degree among all intelligent Christians; that they would delight to acquaint themselves with its glorious truths, and become proficient in the things pertaining to the kingdom of God—fit finally to teach and to preach. The

truth, however, seems to be just the reverse. Not only are Christian teachers comparatively fewer to-day than in the Churches of the apostolic period, but there seems to be also much less interest among Christians in the truth itself; in fact, a degree of ignorance of the teachings of the Word of God which is as astonishing as it is lamentable and shameful. Christians seem to be more intelligent in every thing else than in the doctrines of Christianity, and more efficient in every other capacity than as Christians.

To account for this state of things, we may say first, that there is nothing which can be called a system of Christian teaching in the Church, except in those simple rudiments of Christian knowledge which are appreciable to the immaturity and inexperience of childhood.

The minister is the only teacher of the adult membership. But he does not know that he is teaching; and the people do not know it either, and they do not come with the idea of learning. The minister is supposed to be "preaching;" and that word has come to represent a kind of discourse which has some sort of reference, near or remote, to the subject of religion in some of its various aspects; and the purpose of the discourse is as vague as its character. Perhaps one reason for what Dr. Bushnell calls "the remarkable impotence of preaching in our times," is due to the fact that it has no pronounced character and no definite purpose. It is not preaching; it is not teaching; it is not prophesying. It is sometimes an indiscriminate medley of these and a good many other things beside.

But suppose we consider it teaching; which, more than any thing else, it ought to be, and perhaps generally is. Why is it ineffective as teaching? We have already given one reason—that it has no definite character and object. Another is, that it is delivered at random; that is, it is not called out and directed by the known wants, the expressed opinions, inquiries, doubts of the people. It can not have the interest it would have if given in response to such expressions and inquiries, if the minds of the people were in a responsive state, and if they were taught to regard Christian teaching and the acquisition of Christian knowledge as part of their own business, as something expected of them.

Ministers of extraordinary natural sagacity have sometimes been able to make up, to a certain extent, for the lack of this responsive relation between teacher and people—vital always to the success of

teaching—by their own intuitive perception of the character and wants of the people, and by making human nature a study. But if people were encouraged to express themselves as learners and teachers in the public assemblies of the Church; if this was the prevailing custom, the regular course; if Church members were so interested in Christian knowledge that it was even necessary to forbid the women to speak and to ask questions in the Church,—does any one doubt that the success of the Christian teacher would be much easier and greater, or that he could speak to better purpose whenever a formal discourse should seem desirable? Such a discourse, however, should not come oftener than once on the Sabbath. The people need the rest of the time for exercises which are more Scriptural, and which have proved to be more beneficial, if less stately and ceremonious, than the regular Sunday service of modern times.

But if the people are left, as at present, in the position of mere passive listeners to the random discourses of the ministers—having nothing to do or to say in the matter themselves, scarcely caring whether they make progress or not, and having, in fact, no such object before their minds—why, it is plain that they never will make any respectable attainment in Christian knowledge. They have no stimulus to mental activity in reference to the subjects of Christian thought. They are rather excluded from the opportunity of it. The minister does it all for them; and it is well if they retain interest enough in the subjects he presents so that his discourse is not tedious to them. But upon this plan the minister's discourse frequently is tedious. It can not be otherwise. We are aware that but very few of our public speakers can succeed as lecturers. It is only the ablest, wittiest, and most eloquent, who, being allowed to choose an attractive subject, and to work it up in the manner best calculated to interest, can hold an audience which is at liberty to go. The people, it is true, have nothing to do on Sunday; and having come to Church as a matter of duty, or from whatever motive, are obliged by the laws of propriety and decorum to stay through the service, even if they pay no attention to it. But, on the whole, it is not wonderful that no more attend, and that those who do are so little interested.

The success of Christianity, by our methods, depends not on its own inherent life and power. It depends rather on the talents of the

men we educate to be ministers. To them we assign a task which the most gifted among us could scarcely accomplish; and Christianity, deprived of its proper sources of strength and of its natural forms of activity, is suffered to fail in their failure.

There are occasionally men who succeed, who seem able to carry the whole Church forward by their own unaided strength; but they are men of most remarkable endowments, like Beecher and Spurgeon. They succeed as lecturers, and draw full houses wherever they go. But such men the Churches can not generally have, either now or at any other time; and it is probably well that they can not.

These men succeed by dint of their eminent ability. Of course, they preach Christian truth. So do the others who do not succeed. The inference is plain: the success of Christianity in our administration of it does not depend upon its own inherent life, and its admirable adaptation to human wants. It is bereft of its proper strength; it is not allowed to go forward and thrive of its own God-given life. It must be *carried* to success by the extraordinary powers of our strongest men—men as remarkable for their intellectual strength as for their inexhaustible versatility and tact. With such men, Christianity seems to succeed. Without them, it lives, holds its own, perhaps generally makes a slow and doubtful progress, but can not be said to thrive.

But, it will be said, the members of the Church have their opportunity in the prayer-meeting; more, indeed, than they seem willing to improve. It is indeed true that the opportunities of the prayer-meeting, such as by the present system and custom are allowed to the people, they do not generally care to improve. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that these opportunities are such that they can not improve them, or be greatly improved by them.

The prayer-meeting, as a *Church exercise*, is generally admitted to be a failure. Certainly, not more than one-tenth of the whole membership of our evangelical Churches are in the habit of attending it at all; and many doubtless are deterred from attending, by the very fear that they shall be called upon to "take part in the meeting." But does this prove that Christian worship can no longer proceed successfully on its original basis? that something different is demanded by the spirit of the times—something more formal and stately and imposing? If so, then so much the worse for the times;

for social worship is the only way in which the Church can develop its strength, and generally the only way in which Christians can make any respectable Christian growth. Yet the failure of the present system to accomplish these ends is only too clearly apparent.

There may be many reasons for the failure of Christian worship when left in the hands of the people. It will be sufficient to mention but two. First: instead of being the regular, the most prominent, and important service of the Church, it has been thrust out of all prominence and importance, and never occurs at a time and place most likely to insure the attendance of the people. Second, and chief: the prayer-meeting, so-called, is in general but a miserable caricature of the original social worship of the Church, and is wanting in almost every element which gave to that worship its interest and importance.

The praying is generally not praying at all. The person who prays has generally nothing definite to ask for. There is no impression on his mind of some special blessing which he or the Church seems to need. Ask him the next day what he prayed for at the meeting, and it will be evidence of uncommon memory on his part if he can tell you. He prayed simply to "help carry on the meeting," because he thought it his duty; and his prayer was a rambling, inconsiderate, extemporaneous address to the Deity, who, we may charitably hope, will not hold him responsible for its matter or manner or motive.

A number of such prayers, in which the individual knows nothing what he is going to ask for when he begins, and in fact, having nothing to ask for, asks only for what he happens to think of as he goes along, continuing his speech until he thinks he has made a prayer of about the right length,—a number of such exercises, very similar to each other, makes a prayer-meeting which the people are exhorted to attend and "take part in." There are, of course, occasional and important exceptions to the representation here given; and to these the reader will allow the consideration which, in his judgment, they deserve.

Besides the prayers, there is singing and occasional remarks, to relieve the monotony of the exercises. In regard to the remarks, we may observe that the people generally have nothing to say, any more than they have any thing to pray for. There is no arrangement

under which they would be likely to have any thing to say. No definite subject has been proposed for consideration. There are a score of persons who can speak to a subject, who could give their opinion of a passage of Scripture or reply to any doubt or inquiry which might be suggested, for every one who can succeed in the general, indefinite style of remark which alone seems to be in order at the prayer-meeting. It would remove the whole difficulty in this regard, to restore the original element of teaching as it existed in the Apostolic Churches.

Another difficulty of our social worship is, that the element of prophecy, perhaps owing to a misapprehension of its nature and purpose, has passed wholly from modern Christian thought and effort. This was regarded by Paul as the most important of the exercises of social worship, and as most conducive to the edification of the Church. "*Desire earnestly the spiritual gifts, but rather that ye may prophesy.*"

Prophecy was not generally an attempt to foretell future events. It declared the wonderful works of God in the past, continually putting his people in remembrance. It recognized his agency in the present, and had only such reference to the future as a knowledge of his doings in the past, and a recognition of his present and continual care over his people, would warrant. There is no reason to believe that the gift of prophecy in the ancient Church was a miraculous endowment. It was the result of faith—such a faith in God as made its subject conscious of his immediate presence and agency. It was a constant testimony of God, revealing him as working with his people as they wrought with him, and filling them with confidence and strength and joy. Such an exercise would seem to be especially needful in these days of infidel philosophy, when even many Christians suppose that God is not with his people, present and active; but is rather at an infinite remove from the world, taking no special interest in the affairs of his kingdom. Those who of old walked with God, better understood both him and his ways; and it was in declaring him and his works, in the public assemblies of the Church, "according to the measure of their faith," that those who prophesied, ministered a most important element of joy and consolation and sanctification to his people. The great fact which furnished the subject-matter of this exercise is not peculiar to any age or time.

It is as true now as when God led his ancient people by the hand of Moses and Aaron, or laid the foundation of his kingdom through the ministry of the apostles. Its manifestation is, for obvious reasons, less apparent to the eye of sense; but the great truth itself is eternal and constant, and is always perceptible to the eye of faith; and it would seem that the recognition and expression of it must prove invaluable in all ages, as a means of inspiring the people of God with courage and confidence and strength. We see no reason why the gift of prophecy should not be cultivated in the Church of to-day. Prophecy, or something similar to it, does indeed occasionally occur in the sermon, and more frequently in the prayer, of modern times; but it thus inevitably loses its distinctive character and force. The same may be said of teaching, which is even more strangely out of place in the prayer, where it is, nevertheless, occasionally sought to introduce it. We know not why these elements of worship should not each have its proper place, and be exercised in a proper way, and thus have its proper significance and value.

In reference to the prayer, instead of urging Church members to pray, so as "to help carry on the meeting," we should say it would be vastly better to tell them *not to pray*, unless they have something to ask for. Let them consider whether they have really any thing to ask; something that they really desire, or ought to desire; and then let them be taught not to use vain repetitions, and not to expect that they shall be heard for their much speaking, but rather to stop at once when they have asked for the thing they want, *unless they feel moved* to add a few words of thanksgiving and praise. They would thus come at length to understand the difference between true prayer, and the modern exercise which goes by that name.

So much for the opinion that the members of our Churches have abundant opportunity in the prayer-meeting. In regard to the minister himself, no one will deny that he has sufficient opportunity. His opportunity, indeed, is so great that it becomes a burden of work which he is greatly straightened to accomplish. In fact, he is often dwarfed by overwork, as the people are by want of a suitable exercise of their faculties. More falls to his share than he can possibly perform to his own satisfaction, if he has any intelligent conception of the requirements of his position. He can not possibly do all that ought to be done. He must, therefore, do what seems most neces-

sary—that is, what the people demand of him—and leave the rest undone. He must prepare his two sermons per week; and they must be as able, or at least as entertaining, as he can make them. His personal success, the permanence of his position, depends upon that. His discourses are often forced and artificial—gotten up for the occasion, out of his own intellect and inventive capacity. He preaches, to use the word in the conventional sense, not because he has got something to say, but because he has got to say something. He does not preach the truth as developed in his understanding by the natural, healthful growth of the Christian life within him. He can seldom wait for that; he must preach whatever comes to hand, or whatever he can “get up” in the exigency of the case. As religious teaching, therefore, his discourse can not have a very high value. As lecturing, it may be sparkling, entertaining, original, able, according to his versatility and intellectual capacity. It is, in any case, very rarely a success—if by success we mean spiritual development in the Church and the conversion of men.

Such, we believe, must be the inevitable result of taking away the duties and privileges which were originally common to all Christians, and intended for the exercise and development and profit of all, and consigning them exclusively to a guild of men educated and trained for the purpose, of whom there is room for one, and for but one, in each Church.

But we have been led aside from the course of our investigation. The manner in which the pastoral supervision of the Churches is performed, under the present system, is yet to be considered.

We have seen how, in the present administration of Christianity, the minister is expected to be evangelist, prophet, and teacher, as well as to offer all the prayers of the Church in its public assemblies, and with what success he has undertaken these manifold and responsible duties. We have now to add that he is also the sole and exclusive pastor, expected to exercise all the personal pastoral supervision of the Church which the needs of its members require.

It is but just to observe, however, that in the present stand-still condition of the Churches—or the condition in which the increase is so exclusively drawn from the families of the membership, so that the converts generally enjoy the advantages of religious care and culture at home—there is, of course, less need of pastoral supervision than if

the Churches were gathering a rapid increase from the world. And, considering the other burdens and responsibilities of the minister, it is perhaps well that his pastoral labor, so-called, is in general merely a system of friendly, social visitation among his parishioners, having no reference to the original purpose of the office, and calculated to refresh, rather than exhaust, his overtaxed powers.

But if there were any considerable increase of the Church membership from without, and in cases where there is such an increase, the work of pastoral supervision is not only difficult and laborious, requiring good personal qualities and much patient labor and care, but it is also one of the most important of all the duties of the Church, and one which should on no account be neglected. It is, indeed, for this work and duty that the Church office proper, the office of authority, was originally instituted.

That the minister, already overburdened by other responsibilities and duties, can give the necessary time and labor to this work, is, of course, not to be expected by any rational human being who has a tolerable knowledge of the circumstances. In fact, he does not generally attempt it, not even when a revival has brought large accessions to the Church. As a result, it often happens that more than half the converts whom the Church thus neglects to care for, go back to the world, and their last state becomes worse than the first. It is then supposed that they were not genuinely converted. It is *certainly known* that they had no suitable pastoral care. There will, we believe, be no pretense on the part of any intelligent Christian, that this most important duty is discharged at all in accordance with the design of the original office, or so as to meet the actual wants which the office was intended to supply. What parent would be regarded as maintaining a suitable paternal supervision of the morals of his children, if he should merely call them together in the morning for family devotions, taking no particular heed whether they were all present or not, and should then allow them to go forth to act their own pleasure through the day and night, asking no questions about their habits, occupations, associations, pleasures, or general conduct? Would not such a course be sure to result in the ruin of more than half of his children? And what pastor can be regarded as faithfully discharging the duties of his position, who simply calls his people together—such of them as choose to come

once a week to listen to his instructions—and then dismisses them, new converts and all, to follow their own ways for the ensuing six days?

The parent who would be faithful to his trust must exercise a personal supervision of the daily lives of his children. He must know where they are and what they are doing, how they spend their time, and who are their associates. The paternal office is a type of the pastoral, and success in the one was regarded by the apostle as a necessary qualification for the other. The faithful pastor, therefore, must exercise a similar supervision over the daily lives of his people, especially in the case of new converts, and of others who, owing to their peculiar character or circumstances, may need especial attention. But for this purpose a familiar acquaintance with the situation and circumstances and daily personal surroundings of the individual members is necessary; a condition, indeed, which in general can not exist between any one man, least of all the professional minister of modern times, and any considerable number of the members of a thriving Christian community. For this obvious reason there was, in the apostolic times, a plurality of elders or pastors, as well as of teachers, in every considerable Church.

It is, then, scarcely too much to say, that this most important Church office, regarded in the sense of the original institution, has no existence in the Churches to-day. In many a Church there is not even a suggestion of it, except that the minister is called the pastor. In some forms of Church organization there are, indeed, men who are called elders; but they have made the usual mistake, and imagine that their office is for authority, for government, and not for practical work. They have not conceived the idea that the authority of their office pertains only to its practical functions; being, in fact, assigned to it and to them, only because it is sometimes necessary to control the conduct of the individual Church members among whom the pastors should labor, and that, except in the discharge of the practical duties of the office, they have no business with any authority at all. So the name and, in some instances, the authority of the office remains, while the all-important duty of personal pastoral supervision, the very object for which the office was instituted and authority assigned to it, is left undischarged.

We may remark, in passing, that it is in a correct apprehension

of the nature and objects of this important office, that the true basis of union between Presbyterian and Congregational bodies is to be sought. Nothing can be more obvious to the careful student of the New Testament than the fact that our Baptist and Congregational Churches have departed from the apostolic model of Church organization. Among the more intelligent adherents of these orders, there is no longer a pretense of conformity. For the several pastors, prophets, and teachers of the primitive Church, they have only one man in the Church office; and even he pretends to no authority, and none is allowed him by the congregation.

The Presbyterians easily prove a plurality of elders, and also that the office is one of authority. Their mistake is in supposing that it *exists* for authority, and not for practical work; and in assuming that this authority has reference to the Church as a whole, instead of the individual members whom, in the discharge of pastoral duties, it might be necessary to correct or restrain. The Congregationalists argue, with great plausibility, that the Church must necessarily have authority over the officers it appoints; and their position is now confirmed by the logic of events, as noticed in a previous paper. But the truth is always consistent with itself. The Church does have, and ought to have, authority over the officers it appoints. But the Church, as a body, can not exercise pastoral supervision over its members. Individuals must be appointed for this purpose; and when, in addition to advice, admonition, entreaty, and general personal influence, it was occasionally necessary to use authority such as the unofficial Church member could not exercise, this must be done in the name of the Church and of Christ as its head; and the authority of the Church was delegated to her officers for this purpose. The Church could, of course, annul the action of the elders, if the latter was found to be manifestly unjust or contrary to the Christian rule.

The authority of the elders had reference, of course, only to those who were already members of the Church; who, in case of disobedience and a persistent disregard of Christian obligations, might be suspended from the communion of the Church. Neither the Church nor the elders, nor yet an inspired apostle, could have any right or authority to prevent any man from joining the Church, who professed his belief of the truth and an honest purpose of

obedience to it, and who was thus ready to render the answer of a good conscience toward God in baptism. The practice of requiring a convert to relate an experience, and taking a vote of the members on the question of his admission, is one of the most palpable follies which exists in any form of Church polity to-day.

With regard to the office of deacon, we need only remark that, in some forms of Church polity, it is merely the first grade in the scale of ecclesiastical dignity, representing no practical duty whatever; and in others, the deacons are those who distribute the elements of the Supper among the Church members at the communion service; and that when a man is called deacon in our days, we never once think of him as one who attends personally to the dispensation of the practical benevolence of the Church, in ministering to the wants of the needy and unfortunate in the community. Indeed, there seems to be no system of practical benevolence in most of our Churches, and no deacons or deaconesses according to the original scope of the office. It is unnecessary to say that Christianity and the world suffer greatly from this neglect. There is, indeed, no way in which the former can testify more effectively to the latter concerning its character and purpose.

We come now to the practical question: *What can be done to restore the primitive order in our Churches*; or, at least, to give them some form of organization by which they shall be better able to accomplish their work? If we dismiss the idea of government, and keep in view that of organization for actual work, we may reasonably hope for some good result. The field is new, and therefore all the more promising and hopeful. The question heretofore has been government, and not organization. Wesley alone introduced into his system some features with a view to practical effect. His system of itinerancy, as at first instituted, unquestionably gave to his preachers a more evangelical character, keeping them more exclusively to a strictly evangelical work, and in its later development is valuable as an economical dispensation of the time and talents of the ministry, securing better sermons for the Methodist Churches than the same class of men could otherwise produce; while the Methodist class-leaders are probably nearer in the nature and scope of their office to the elders of the primitive Churches than any other class of men in the Churches to-day. Yet the

adoption of these features was accidental, or rather providential, and not the result of calculation or an intelligent understanding of the New Testament system on the part of Wesley. His class-leaders were originally collectors, appointed for the purpose of gathering contributions among his converts. These collectors soon found that, in addition to their proper business, there were also moral irregularities to be looked after among the members whom they thus had frequent occasion to visit, and thus was suggested to Wesley the idea of a systematic moral supervision of his converts. It is not probable that he ever once dreamed that the office he thus created bore any resemblance to that of the elders in the primitive Church; and, in fact, there is as much difference as similarity, and the efficiency of the system will be greatly improved when the resemblance is more complete.

Again, when the Churches were shut against him, and he was thus compelled to go forth himself, and to send forth his illiterate itinerants into the highways and hedges of England, to preach wherever people could be gathered to listen, his ministry became more evangelical in its character as a necessary consequence, and not because Wesley had foreseen or intended such a result; which, however, in this case as in the former, he had the good sense to try to perpetuate and promote.

The success of Methodism is, we believe, due almost entirely to the two features thus suggested; namely, the class system and the itinerancy of the ministry. Without these two great facts which thus entered into the structure of Methodism, even the zeal of the primitive Methodists could scarcely have resulted in any permanent advantage to the Church. The significance of these two features lies in the fact, that in the one there was a partial and unconscious recognition of the distinction between preaching and teaching, an arrangement by which what is called preaching became, to a considerable extent at least, preaching in reality; and in the other, the original office of pastor or elder has been partially and unconsciously restored.*

If so much has resulted from an accidental and partial restoration

*It should be observed that what was originally most valuable in either of these features, is practically lost in their present degenerate form, the itinerancy being now merely a means of economizing ministerial talent, and the class-leader merely taking the lead in the meetings of his class, instead of exercising personal pastoral supervision.

of some of the practical features in the organization of the ancient Church, how much may we hope from a careful and intelligent endeavor to restore all the original offices of the Church and all her practical functions!

The Disciples, more than any other ecclesiastical organization in this country, are in a condition to effect this restoration. They are, by position and principle, a body of progressive reformers. They have never imagined that the reformation which they have thus far effected is final and complete, but hold themselves ready to adopt any new and true development of doctrine, or any real improvement of method. Unlike most ecclesiastical bodies, they have never committed themselves to the belief that any system which is, as it were, merely an historical accident produced by the breaking-up of old institutions, and descended through a few generations or centuries, is the one only possible true and perfect Church; and they have thus avoided the stupendous folly of laboring with all the zeal of partisan interest to perpetuate their own disabilities and errors. They are, indeed, determined to prove all things, and to hold fast only the true; but not to hold it in such a way as to exclude all other truth. It is this distinguishing feature of their organization and purpose which entitles them to rank as the most hopeful and promising of the American Churches.

The subject of Church organization is, therefore, an open question with the Disciples, and has lately been freely discussed in their publications. But it is not merely an open question. It has been brought into special prominence at the present time by the course of events connected with their movement. The success which has attended their evangelical efforts has been so great, and their increase so rapid, that it has been found impossible to supply even half of the new Churches with ministers; and the increase is not likely to be less rapid in the future than in the past. Their choice, therefore, is between a system of itinerancy and a system of Church organization by which, as in apostolic times, the Churches can live and thrive without a professional minister. But the free spirit in which their movement was conceived, and the hostility to ecclesiasticism which it has evolved, while it is probably incompatible with the idea of itinerancy or any form of diocesan episcopacy, is eminently favorable to the restoration of the free constitution of

the apostolic Churches. The question, therefore, of present and paramount importance with the Disciples—that upon which, more than any other, the future of their movement depends—is the question of Church Organization.

Our views of the general subject have, we trust, already been expressed with sufficient clearness. It only remains for us to add a few practical suggestions as to the manner in which we think the needed reform might best be effected among the Churches of the Disciples.

And, first, it is evident that if any improvement in this regard is to be effected at all, the ministers must take the lead in the work. The Churches can only co-operate with them, and second their efforts. Let the ministry, then, endeavor to arrive at a clear conception of the different general functions of the primitive Churches. The charismata, or spiritual gifts, answering to these several functions, were indeed originally developed under the immediate influence and direction of the Holy Spirit; but they were not arbitrary. They rather corresponded to distinct and definite fundamental wants; and the activity of the Church, through the different functions thus indicated, was needful to the healthful development of its internal life, upon which the external efficiency of any Church must depend. These general functions are, then, of fundamental importance, and are all needed in the Churches to-day. Let the ministers, then, explain and illustrate these functions for their people, relying, as did the primitive evangelists, upon the assistance of the Holy Spirit, by which alone they may be rightly apprehended and successfully fulfilled.

As has already been intimated, we regard it as a matter of the first importance to correct those ideas and habits of speech by which preaching and teaching, two entirely distinct functions, are so generally confounded. Unless this shall be done, we have no right to expect any really effective work in either direction. Let the ministers and the people both understand that the ordinary pulpit discourse is not preaching, and that no one has a right to call it so. The distinction here indicated is already better understood by the Disciples than by any other body of Christians. They have evangelists, or preachers, whose duty it is to go forth with the definite purpose of inducing men to believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God

and Savior of men, and of persuading them to be obedient to this faith. They know that this is preaching, and that much that they hear from the pulpits is not preaching, but teaching. Still there is room for improvement in the prevailing conception, as well as in the prevalent practice. It needs to be more fully understood that *preaching is carrying the Gospel to the unconverted*, and that this may be done in familiar personal conversation, and day by day, and from house to house, as well, in fact often better, than by a public discourse. The true meaning of the word can never be restored so long as we continue its use in the present sense; and the interests of real preaching will certainly suffer, so long as that which is not preaching is called by that name.

The minister may preach by carrying the Gospel outside the doors of the Church, as he may have time and opportunity; but we believe he would do well to give his first and principal effort to the work of organizing his Church, so that it can, in a sense, take care of itself; to putting the gifts of the members in the way of a healthy, generous development. If he can succeed in this, he will find more time for preaching afterward. Let him gain time for this effort by omitting one of the two weekly discourses he now prepares. Then let the whole Church, at one of its regular Sabbath sessions, be resolved into a meeting for teaching and inquiry, under his presidency. This meeting might at first take the form of a Bible-class, with subject previously announced; avoiding, however, as much as possible, any approach to catechetical methods. Thus let the minister contrive *to set the minds of the people at work*, recognizing the fact that there can otherwise be no satisfactory progress in Christian knowledge; that the sermons of an angel from heaven could not avail for the purpose, unless the people can be inspired with an interest to seek and inquire for themselves. When they are once fairly started in this course, they will be ready enough to express their views. Concert of action between the minister and leading members, and previous preparation on their part and on his, will doubtless, at first, be necessary. But if the effort is earnestly and perseveringly made, it will succeed; and it will be a most important success.

The minister might prepare his public discourses with a view to awakening an interest in the subjects he proposes for investigation, or with a view to a more complete explanation of them after they

have been considered in the meeting of the Church ; and the latter should provide itself with a library of commentaries, ecclesiastical histories, biographies of eminent Church teachers, and such other books as might furnish the needed information upon subjects of Christian knowledge, or conduce to the general interest of their pursuit.

The exercises thence resulting would doubtless occasionally take the form of prophecy, especially in the case of persons of high emotional nature and mature Christian development.

Prayer, also, in its true sense, when once that is rightly apprehended, and the singing of hymns and spiritual songs, would naturally and readily take their place in the services ; and thus the original social worship of the primitive Churches would be restored ; or rather there would be a beginning of such restoration, to become more extensive and complete as, year by year, under the influence of Christian truth and the direction of the Spirit, the members should continually make higher Christian attainment, and the functions of the Church should be ever more fully developed.

Next, let the elders, the minister among the rest, begin to look after the daily lives of the individual members of their Churches, such of them at least as may need, or might be profited by, such attention ; inquiring what books they read, how they spend their leisure time, who are their associates, and whether they attend Church regularly or not ; offering advice and assistance, where needful,—and doing all this on the score of familiar, friendly association and kindly personal interest, and never presuming to exercise authority, except in cases of obvious and urgent necessity.

Let the deacons also, assisted if necessary by deaconesses, begin to look after the material welfare of the members, inquiring not merely whether there are any who actually need assistance, but also whether there are any deserving or promising members who may be aided by finding them employment, or assisting them to secure positions ; and let Christians, under the direction of their deacons, be as faithful and efficient as Odd-fellows and Free Masons in assisting to carry the burdens of their brethren, and in compensating them for their losses. The Church will thus begin to assume its true position and its original character ; and the names brother, sister, as applied by Church members to each other, will no longer bear a suggestion of emptiness and insincerity.

Let the deacons also find where the charity of the Church may be profitably bestowed outside her immediate borders, dispensing her blessings in the name of Christ, and thus bearing effective testimony to the mission and purpose of Christianity in the world.

We are fully persuaded that the intelligent ministers of the Disciples can in no other way do so much for the interest of their Churches and the cause they represent, as by devoting themselves to this work of practical organization. Those who co-operate with them as elders, deacons, and teachers, must, of course, at first give much of their time gratuitously to the Lord's work; but they can not be better employed, and at length the Churches will find means to compensate them for their sacrifices.

But there are many Churches, probably more than half of all the Churches of the Disciples, who have not, and can not have, any professional minister. Obviously these need the original, practical form of organization more than the others. Many of them are actually almost dying for the want of it. Yet it is not to be expected that they can accomplish this work for themselves. It seems desirable that the most intelligent and capable of our ministers should be sent out to assist them, residing with each Church a few months, and proceeding from one place to another, as fast as the work can be done. Evangelists who are competent, practical men, can, we believe, scarcely do better than to employ themselves in this way. We can not believe that it would be wise to make any extensive effort for the planting of new Churches, until those which are already planted shall be thoroughly established; and wherever a new Church is formed, the evangelist by whose preaching it is gathered, should remain with it until its organization is complete—until he sees that the Church can successfully fulfill its functions without further outside assistance. Paul remained long at Antioch and at Ephesus and at Corinth; and in many places where, having gathered a Church, he was obliged to flee before its organization was complete, he left his co-workers behind him to finish the work; returning also himself to confirm and establish them, as he had opportunity. But he always left them at last to depend on their own resources; and they continued to grow and thrive without him, or other foreign assistance.

We hear much of the principle of Church independency in our days. It is, we believe, a most important and necessary principle,

vital to the true success of Christianity in this, as in all other ages. But here again we fall into the old error of referring the principle to government, rather than to practical work. It is with small reason that a Church claims to be independent, because it believes itself capable of managing its own difficulties. Those Churches only are truly independent who are able *to do their own work*; who can live and thrive out of their own unaided resources, assisted only by the Word and Spirit and providence of God; who can fulfill all their functions alone, and successfully carry forward the Master's work in the communities in which they are located.

The principle of Church independency is a true one. Christianity truly possesses a self-perpetuating life. If it is allowed its free course of development, and is aided by Scriptural organization, it can sustain itself and thrive in the Churches where it has once been fairly established. If it can not; if it must be continually sustained by external resources, and be nursed with external sustenance,—then there is little encouragement for attempting to propagate it. But every thing in this regard depends upon organization; and this, we believe, is the great question for our Churches to-day; and whether the suggestions of this paper be accepted or not, we trust that the subject itself may receive the earnest, thoughtful, prayerful attention its importance deserves.

VI.—CHRISTIANITY ON THE PLANET MARS.

THE object of the adventure here proposed, is to place the religion of Christ at such a distance that our reasonings concerning it may not be embarrassed by habitual proximity. This visual distance is fixed upon to avoid, if possible, the old ruts of thought that heretofore may have controlled our logic; and if our religion looks well so far away from home, we shall feel still more certain that our faith is not the result merely of a smothering nearness of the evidences. The planet Mars is selected, because it is one of our nearest neighbors, and in many of its physical features is well known to resemble the earth more than any other world. Possessed of land and water, an atmosphere, four seasons in its year, and circling around the same center, its habitation by intelligent beings verisimilar to ourselves is by no means improbable. Its day is only thirty-nine minutes and twenty-one seconds longer than ours, and the inclination of its axis nearly the same. Its seas are greenish, and its soil ochery, reflecting the reddish hue that our red sandstone districts may possibly manifest to them. Snows cover its poles alternately in Winter, and melt away in Summer. Its atmosphere is lighter than its water, and so lies above it. Hence, evaporation must take place; hence, thunderstorms, rains, springs, rivulets, rivers, agriculture, fruitful seasons, droughts, high prices, and occasional famine. With a geography and meteorology so much like our own, it is not unreasonable to suppose their bodily organizations similar also—with similar locomotion, with five senses, acquainted with letters, music, poetry, mathematics, and the mechanic arts. They live in houses, care for their children, have civil and military organizations, commerce, international laws, elections, congresses, lobbyists, bribery, and possibly whisky. They are born, grow up, marry, amass fortunes, lose them, grow old, die, and submit to tombstones, as we do.

With all these facts favoring our purpose, the assumption of intellectual and moral similarities will not be thought extravagant. They probably have desires, sensibility, and will; consciences, sense of right and wrong, and belief in a Supreme Being. What, then, of their form of religion? How would Christianity suit them?

Before considering this subject, the plausibility of several other questions must be determined. Whether they were *created outright*, as is believed of our Adam and Eve, or sprung originally from the larvæ of the lowest animal organizations—crawling through the mud of vast geological periods, with bony fins, stolid snout, and serpent tail—ought first to be settled with a reasonable degree of certainty.

If the ambitious little creatures hung on to the rights of their primogeniture all the way through, from their lizardhood up to their monkeyhood; and then, by a bold *coup de main*, made the last milestone in the course, and demanded a conscience, intelligence, and a religious nature,—they deserve our profoundest respect. Or, as Mr. Huxley would seem to have it, in his "Physical Basis of Life," if the protoplasms that constitute the snail or snake, by a little adjustment or polarization, may constitute for man very respectable "moral feelings" and a good enough conscience, it is possible that the inhabitants of Mars have had no higher origin. And yet there steals over us an uncontrollable feeling of greater respect, both for Creator and creature, when we think of an immediate act of Divine power in the erection of this noblest of all the tenantry of any physical world. But if we consult the dicta of physical science, no proposition is more fully demonstrated than that *dead matter* never produces *life of any kind*—not even the larvæ; and the problem as to the origin of the lowest forms of life and that of the highest, is just the same. If dead matter, cleared of all seeds of vegetable and animal life—as shown by Frankland and others, and admitted by all evolutionists—is incapable, under the most favorable temperature, of producing the least sign of life, it follows that the presence of a fossil lizard in the primary formation commands our belief in a Divine act of creation, whether the argument be made upon the earth or on Mars. The seeds of plants and the spermatozoa of animals are indispensable to the production of other plants and animals; and it would have been no less a direct act of creation to fill the world with these germs of life, separate from vegetable and animal bodies, than to create the organized bodies containing them, as they contain them now. If, therefore, a sovereign act of creative power is necessary to bring even the seeds of life into being by either of the above methods, it was no more difficult, and fully as respectable, to speak the Marsians into glorious manhood at once, as to have dragged them

through the slime of ages to reach their present state. Moreover, as that world so much resembles ours in other respects, it is probable also that its fossil-beds argue as stoutly against the development theory as ours do—showing that each period produced the largest and best specimens of animals *at the first*, while the feeblest and most imperfect always appear at the close of each period. "The magnates walked before." This leaves no chance for the lower to develop by gradual growth into the higher forms of life, breaks the backbone of Darwinian speculation, and gives countenance to the old Bible doctrine of the immediate creation of an Adam and Eve, which, placed at a distance of forty-seven million miles, loses nothing of the reasonableness it possesses upon the earth.

The origin of evil has long been an enigma to philosophers in this world, owing in part to the hampering proximity of the difficulty. Seen at a distance, it may not be so perplexing. Like all other *creatures*, the inhabitants of that world are finite in all their capacities, physical, intellectual, and moral. Otherwise, they would all be infinites. They need some guidance, therefore, in the form of law, to supplement their ignorance as to what course of conduct is best for their future interests. We know the law of gravitation, and other physical laws, hold sway there as well as here; and why not moral laws? Their ignorance and carelessness have often caused them to fall from a precipice, to eat or drink intemperately, to cut their flesh with edge-tools, and to suffer the consequences. They are *liable* to sin, and therefore probably have sinned; and the origin of sin and pain, in persons pure from the hands of their Maker, is no more mysterious than the origin of a festering sore by a wound in flesh that was perfectly sound. This liability to sin does not palliate the guilt of sin, any more than liability to get drunk excuses the guilt of drunkenness. The very establishment of a moral character requires that we be liable to sin; and hence the saying that "all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," loses nothing of its reasonableness by being transferred to another world.

The question of sin is of but small consequence until that of their probable *immortality* is considered. Physically contemplated, we might say of them, "Lord, what is man, that thou art mindful of him?" Looked for from this distance, he may be a million times smaller than the least of our animalcula. But no creature, world, or

even system of worlds, is great when compared to all things, and especially when compared to space. Millions of the mightiest spheres, and even universes, are beyond the reach of our strongest magnifiers, so that even they to us are of animalcular dimensions. As a thousand years is no more an appreciable part of eternity than a day, so the bulk of the largest world falls about as far short of being significant in space as an inhabitant of Mars ; so that, on that ground, no proper estimates can be made of man's real consequence among created things.

The fact that, with only three or four pounds of brain to work with, man can accomplish such intellectual wonders, is no feeble intimation of his more than corporeal nature. To do a very large business with a very small capital, throwing out the sides of his triangles to sun, moon, and stars, fixing their distances, calculating their eclipses and their periods to the moment, weighing their avoir-dupois, determining their densities and deciding with unerring precision the very material of which they are composed, with so small a base of operations as a human brain, indicates that something immortal handles the feeble instrument of all these achievements. To consider his powers of wonderful abstraction, generalization, mathematics, æsthetics, moral discriminations, and conscience, and to find all these energies issuing from a source, physically considered, so diminutive, more than answers the objection to his immortality and consequence in the universe drawn from his animalcular proportions. The feeding of five thousand from five loaves and two small fishes, as a development of great results from small resources, illustrates the same immortal powers by the physical disparity between the apparent cause and the manifest effects.

The most plausible argument ever offered by materialists against our natural immortality, is based in the fact that some of the mental endowments of man are found also in the brute creation—memory, fear, resentment, affection, and a degree of understanding. It is admitted that man passes on in his development to much higher qualities of mind ; but the fact that the two overlap each other on one side of human nature is supposed to show, that if death can drag down some, it can and will destroy all, mental endowments. This would be true if it were first proved that the two natures belong to the same class of things. A small tree and a large one

are one in nature; the drought, the ax, or the fire that will destroy the one, will destroy the other; and the fact that the one has begun to bear fruit and the other has not been so far developed, will be nothing in the way of a like destruction from the same cause. But heat and wood belong to very different classes of things, and that which destroys the form of the one only evolves the powers of the other. The atmosphere is the medium through which sunlight operates in this world; but the utter destruction of the atmosphere would not disturb the existence of light. There are worlds that have no atmosphere; but that has never disturbed the sun: nor would it, if the Creator should instantly retire every atmosphere in the universe into nonentity. So may the immortal part of man use a human body, and even some of the animal endowments, as accompaniments of its own powers, without losing any thing essential to itself when death dissolves the temporary connection.

But if the mere overlapping of similar capacities is to prove identity of nature, then may we not prove that vegetables and animals are one and the same. The plant has organization, circulation, respiration, and even incipient sensibility. Some plants have organizations even superior to some animals, and the same logic would prove both to belong to the same class of things. Notwithstanding a plant is *not* an animal, the very fact that the sponge is a connecting link between these two kingdoms of nature, shows that there is a division-line that must be passed in going out of one territory into the other; and while God has left no gaping chasms in creation, he has left no doubt as to the different ranks in creation. It is true these lines of separation are not very distinct. Neither is it easy to tell just where night ceases and daylight begins, nor to mark the exact time when the irresponsibility of childhood ceases and responsibility begins; but that the one differs broadly from the other, that night differs from day, that animals differ from plants, and man from the brute, must be admitted by every fair thinker, who is not spoiled by "vain deceit" and by "philosophy, falsely so called."

The true differential between men and animals is not found in the body, nor in the understanding which Coleridge claims for animals; but in the conscience, the moral sense of right and wrong, of which there is no evidence that brutes possess the least.

Whatever force may be in the above reasonings, applies to the inhabitants of Mars as well as to us, provided they, as we assume, have plants, animals, day, night, responsibility, and irresponsibility, like ourselves, and leaves us to predicate immortality of them without involving the least absurdity. And, indeed, without assuming any greater intellectual capacity for them than we possess, we may believe them to have accomplished much more in astronomical observations than we shall ever be able to achieve. It was a magnificent movement to discover the relations of the angles and sides of a triangle to each other, and thereby found the science of trigonometry, even when its use was confined to the measurement of distances on the earth; but when man conceived the idea of making first the semi-diameter of the earth his base-line to measure untrod-den space to distant worlds, and then, by a diviner endeavor still, seized the diameter of the earth's orbit as his base-line, he exhausted forever this element of his calculation of celestial distances. This diameter of 190,000,000 miles multiplied by 160,000 gives 15,200,000,000,000, which is the utmost distance to which we can ever throw our measuring lines into space—a parallax beyond that being impossible while our orbit remains the same. But our neighbor geometers, no more content with the semi-diameter of their little world (4,100 miles) than we were, have probably, ere this, seized the diameter of their orbit (284,000,000 miles), and multiplying this by the above factor, have been able to throw out the side lines of their triangle to the amazing distance of 7,520,000,000,000 *beyond the last star whose distance we can ever measure*; and whether we admit the immortality of the Marsians or not, such capacity would be no disgrace to an immortal spiritual being. And even if the approximation of animal understanding to that of man should discount the belief of any one in human immortality, he must admit that the addition of an immortal spiritual nature to such exalted mental capacity, would be no more remarkable than the union of a Newtonian intellect with a material body. The disparity can be no greater between immortal spirit and mortal mind than between such mind and inanimate matter. Besides this, as has often been said, God furnishes satisfactory responses to all other natural desires of his creatures; such as hunger, thirst, desire to possess, to know, and to be great; and it would be reasonable that

he should satisfy the desires of that people as to eternal life, reunion with friends after death, and illimitable enjoyment in heaven. To say the least, our hopes of immortality do not become absurd when looked at on another world, and relieved of the influences that may have controlled our logic here.

Allowing that their immortality is neither unthinkable nor unreasonable, would the assumption that God has in some way written or spoken his will to them appear so? The assertion in our Book that no man knows the things of any given man except his own spirit, and that to know God's will you must have the spirit of God, as the apostles and prophets had, would not be absurd if predicated of a distant world. It would be absurd to argue that he who created a mind like Paul's, with such wonderful capacity and intelligence, could not manage to inform it of its own nature, duties, and destiny; and assuming that he purposed to speak to them at all, the inspiration of such men would be a more successful method than to amaze and bewilder them with the uncovered brightness of a messenger direct from heaven.

But to gain the highest results from an attempt to reach inferior intelligences, mere words, law, and holy precepts, without a practical demonstration of the same in daily life, such as the best of men have never exhibited, would utterly fail. Religion concreted and incorporated into one grand life, such as that of Jesus Christ, would seem to be necessary. Hence the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the doctrine of incarnation, when viewed at a distance, should be considered. We affirm nothing as to the *mode of existence* in the Godhead as a basis for our belief, nor do we allow the absurdity of any current speculation to deter us from accepting the doctrine of "God with us" in its fullest meaning. The idea of "three in one," however, or one composed of three, is not an absurdity. In man's constitution is found a trinity—body, soul, and spirit. In his body alone are the osseous, muscular, circulatory, and nervous systems—four in one. It need not be affirmed that the relation between the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit resembles either of the above arrangements; but they relieve not only Trinity, but Quadrinity, from the charge of absurdity. White light contains seven distinct colors, neither of which in the least resembles the composite white. We can easily believe that two substances may

chemically unite and form a *tertium quid*; but when theology asserts that both the human and divine found complete expression in Jesus of Nazareth, Rationalism is amazed at our credulity. Matter and mind may unite in one; philosophy may assert that no black object, on account of the complete absorption of all the rays of light, has ever yet been seen, or assert any other scientific paradox, and there is no complaint; but the moment we affirm the divinity of Christ, doubt and rejection of the proposition become the insignia of superior erudition. Whether the saying, "I and my Father are one," indicates the same kind of oneness as the prayer for the disciples, "that they all might be one," or oneness in any other sense, or under any other form, it must be admitted that God may be with the Marsians in some very consistent and practical way, whether they understand the mystery of incarnation or not. Suppose it were simply announced on that world that "in the beginning was the Logos, the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God; that he became flesh and dwelt among them;" what impossibility is lodged 'n the assertion? Is it that God could not in some way assume the form of man without abandoning his proper individuality as God? Belief in the divinity of Christ in the fullest sense, in no way hinders our belief in the possibility of God's being manifested in the flesh in more worlds than one, and at the same time. Here, again, we may utterly fail in illustration; but suppose the sun should kindle a fire on a thousand dark worlds at once, just like himself as to quality of light and heat, would not each one fairly represent the sun and be able to say, "I came forth from him;" "I and the sun are one;" "He that hath seen me, hath seen the sun;" "The sun has no element not found in me;" "I am the light of your world?" The language of the Scriptures may be so understood without derogating at all from the lofty claims of Him in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead substantially. An inspired man receives and reflects the light and life of God; but Jesus has "life in himself;" and his appearance on the planet Mars in this character, is not only a very thinkable circumstance, but may be the best possible method of conveying to them a practical knowledge of God.

Some regard the incarnation of Christ as a method of reaching men, as scarcely consistent with Divine dignity; but had any one of us a desire to communicate with a world of insects in behalf of

some possible interest of theirs, sufficient to call forth our sympathies, how could such communication be effected with the use of our present vocabulary? How, without reducing ourselves, or some one of ourselves, to their condition and nature, and become an insect in order to speak to insects? How, without adopting their language, modes of expression, entering into their sympathies, and winning their affections? When the six hundred Moravians, in the days of Count Zinzendorf, set out as missionaries to conquer the heathen world for Christ, two of their number went to the Island of St. Thomas to preach to the slaves there; but, finding that the condition of society forbid all access to them, they voluntarily sold themselves for slaves, that they might reach them and bear the message of life. This is the nearest approach in the annals of time to the humiliation and love of Jesus Christ, and mightily indorses the necessity of his having become flesh to reach us, and that we might feel that he was "touched with the feeling of our infirmity."

If the inhabitants of that world resemble us in moral constitution, sin renders them unhappy. It seems reasonable, also, that like a thorn in the flesh, it must be extracted to alleviate the pain. In this world, pain is our friend; it is God's monitor of increasing pain and ultimate ruin, if the cause be not removed; and the principle does not seem strange at that distance. The slightest febrile excitement, the almost imperceptible nausea, and such like delicate intimations of the approach of some hostile influence into the system, at first only suggest the expulsion of the foe; but if neglected, the modest monitors begin to raise alarms and tumults, and never cease their warnings till death dispenses with their services. One might say that thorns up there produce no pain, and that sin meets no punishment; but it is as unthinkable as that three and three, with them, do not make six; that they have no law of gravitation, or that they make no distinction between right and wrong.

If sin remains in their souls for a decade, a century, or a millennium, our philosophers fail to see how the attendant pain can have a shorter term. The presence of sin and pain seem on principle to be coetaneous; and if so, it is useless to argue the question of endless punishment, as it all turns upon the question of forgiveness of the sin and its removal from the soul. Some think it safe enough to ignore the necessity of justification through Christ, and weigh anchor

for the shoreless sea in uncertain hope; but to say the best of this, it is unsafe, and it will be better for the Marsians not to risk it. Moreover, if moral conditions become unalterable there, as well as here, he that is filthy at the end of his probationary state, will be filthy still. Neglected education incurs an ignorant old age. Slothfulness sowed no seed in its season, and the crop is forever lost; the practiced scoundrel, whose "eyes are full of adultery, and that can not cease from sin," amid all the good influences of civilization and religion, will scarcely surrender sin in the next world, nor escape its penalty,—all of which suggests the policy of disengaging sin in this life, and before the Gorgon head of death has stereotyped it forever in the soul.

It is not unreasonable to suppose that rationalists on that world insist upon the harmlessness of sin, and the uselessness of alarm on account of it, nor to suppose that their theologians resist them with some such argument as this: "Suppose some mighty Spirit had power and disposition to break the centrifugal force of our world, and send it hurriedly, pole over pole, to the sun, or snap the centripetal chord and let it fly to the other side of the dog-star,—it is nothing but a sin against physical things, and yet utter physical disaster results. Or sever the jugular veins of the body,—it is only a sin, and can be perpetrated in a moment. A soul breaks away from God, into darkness, coldness, and disaster irreparable, by nothing but a sin that may be committed in an hour. Nor is the duration of such consequences to be measured by the time occupied in sinning. As malaria, the sword, or an explosion may, in a moment, damage what ages can not repair, sin once accepted and cherished may so disrupt the texture of the moral nature, that eternity may not be able to mend the breach. As even a homeopathic dose of virus taken up by the absorbents into the circulation develops convulsions and death, the smallest sin, if entertained and loved, becomes the seed of inevitable ruin to the soul."

Unless two and two make four here, and forty there; unless all the angles of a triangle are equal to two right angles here, and five there; unless justice, mercy, and truth are commendable here, and indifferent there; and every other mathematical and moral principle is subverted as soon as transported to another world,—there can be no fairness in rejecting the above reasoning of our neighbor theo-

logian. The skeptic is defeated and the preacher triumphant, as to the nature of sin. Moreover, should that world ever dash off into depths of space, where comets tarry in their unknown aphelions, it would possess no inherent power of returning to its orbit. Gravitation can not bring it back. A broken law can never redeem an offender. A miracle only could restore it to its place. God might move the whole solar system right after it, until its own orbit would overtake it, and establish its former relations. And should our foreign evangelist reason that, when man became "a wandering star for whom was reserved the blackness of darkness forever," it required the Sun of righteousness, with the angels and the whole system of Divine influences, to move after him to overtake him in his helplessness, and bring him back to his forgiving God, it would be useless for friend or foe to deny the force of his logic.

While every fundamental principle of the Christian religion, viewed at such a visual distance, would be equally justified at the bar of sound philosophy and common sense, our limits forbid a progress into other specifications beyond the following, which illustrates the inconsistency of skepticism in rejecting Divine revelation as an aid to the soul. The rationalist is Paul's "natural man, who receiveth not the things of the Spirit;" denies revelation, and depends wholly upon the sensuous inlets to the mind for all he knows of the spiritual universe. The things of the Spirit he "can not know," because he rejects the source of such knowledge. The ear can not detect color, nor the eye sound. No more can our five senses discern that which is only discerned by revelation. And why should not the soul need Divine assistance in the discharge of its highest functions, as well as the body and the intellect? No man depends upon his own muscular force for every physical effect. He subsidizes the muscles of the more massive animals, the water-fall, the wind, steam, gunpowder, nitro-glycerine, and other natural agencies, to supplement his natural weakness. In locomotion, we accept the steam-ship, rail-cars, and would like to navigate the air. To aid the senses, we accept the ear-trumpet, magnifying-glasses, and many other supplements to their weakness. The intellect may harness the lightning, and in a moment flash its thought around the world; but the soul, depending upon the bodily senses, slow and sluggish, must go afoot. The intellect may invent a spectroscope, and erect every ray of light

from the most distant world into as many telegraph-lines, revealing with unerring certainty its physical constitution and characteristics; and yet faith is denied to the soul to bring a knowledge of that world with which *it* is most concerned. As well might you deny an astronomer all knowledge of the sun until he visit it. But as the body and the mind both subsidize other abilities to strengthen and lengthen their reach beyond what is natural to themselves, there is no reason why the soul should not be allowed to "receive the things of the Spirit;" and, erecting faith as its telescope, accept every ray of light from the throne of God, that tells it of things not seen. The light of science brings no redemption to the sinful soul. The telespectroscope tells us much of light from distant worlds, but knows nothing of "the light of the knowledge of the glory of God." This is revealed only by the Spirit, to supplement the weakness of the soul.

But does God take care of beings so insignificant as the men of Mars? Are the hairs of their heads all numbered? David said, "Lord, what is man, that thou art mindful of him?" There being no telescopes for twenty-six hundred years after his death, he could count about one thousand stars only. Had he known of the one hundred million now known to be in our universe, and of the six thousand other universes that lie in space at inconceivable distances from us, and from each other; and had the fact then been revealed, as it is now, that two-thirds of those nebular-looking universes are already organized into solid worlds, and the other third in a gaseous state constituting so many laboratories for world-building, with all their physical laws and all their tenantry of land and sea,—he would have put the above question with an emphasis inconceivable at that time. Is it reasonable that the Architect of all these should say to man, "I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee?" Do their sparrows not fall without the Father? or is he too much engaged in universe-building, laying off infinite space in centers, circumferences, and orbits, and arranging centripetals, centrifugals, eclipses, and periods, to notice such an entity as man? To this question, which to many hearts is no stranger, nor very welcome, the following replies may be made:

1. The Almighty bestows care on the whole animal creation, that is of far less consequence than man. "How much better is a

man than a sheep!" "Ye are of more value than many sparrows." Think of the animalcula, myriads of which can frolic in a drop of water for a life-time. All these "receive their meat from God," who supplies "the wants of every living thing." He took time to order them into existence, made their frames, laid every tiny muscle to its place, established their circulation and pulsation. If these infinitesimals populate the planet Mars, and God cares for them, he surely would not consider it lost time to care for those who are only "a little lower than the angels," spiritually, and are at least half-way from nihility to infinity, even in their physical proportions.

2. The greatest minds among men are those that can manage the largest transactions in business, and at the same time attend to all the minutest details thereof. Infinite power reaches to infinity in both directions, and expresses itself as mightily in the generation and preservation of the minutest existence, as in conferring luminosity upon the morning-star. Fear not, then, little flock. "It is the Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." You shall judge the world. You shall judge angels.

3. But the chief consideration is found in the infinite love of God for immortal souls, made originally in his own image, and then renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created them. The value of the spirit is not to be estimated by the avoirdupois of the house it lives in. No physical integers can weigh, measure, or value it. Nor can its temporary alliance with matter discount its value as a spirit, which can take up the wings of the morning and fly to the uttermost parts of the east, to Sirius or Orion, and bring back intelligence almost divine, while the body had never been able to leave its heavy home. Add to this its constant growth in grace and in likeness to the Divine image, its justification and adoption into the family of God, its having come already "to Mount Zion, to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to the innumerable company of angels;" and we can see why "the Father of our spirits" "is not ashamed to be called their God." Hence, "He has prepared for them a city." "Blessed are they that do His commandments, for they shall have a right to the tree of life, and shall enter in through the gates into the city."

Here we leave our subject and our readers, uncertain whether our

excursion will prove as beneficial to any other as it has to the writer. Some things look well enough at home, but very ludicrous abroad, when seen under other circumstances. We have taken ten of the most fundamental principles of the Christian religion, and have set them off far enough to be judged of without any embarrassing proximity of the evidences, and find them all to proclaim their divinity there, no less than here. We return with a fuller conviction than ever, that Jesus is the Christ; and are persuaded that it would be no less difficult to change the principles of his religion than to change the principles of mathematics or the laws that govern all physical things; and hence our "hope of eternal life, which God, who can not lie, promised before the world began."

VII.—THE VICTORY OF FAITH.

THE world is a great battle-field, and every man is called to be a soldier. Either conquest or defeat is to be the record of each day of our life. Something must be won or lost in every conflict; and as we can not choose but to fight, it is of the utmost importance for us to be assured that our cause is just, and that the weapons of our warfare are approved of God.

REAL VICTORIES.

All real victories are the result of principle. The true overcomes the false; the right overcomes the wrong; good succeeds at length over evil. This is seen in science and in art, in politics and in religion, in law and in government. The conflict may be long and desperate, but the end is certain. "Truth may fall in the streets, and equity may not enter," but the result is not doubtful.

"Alone her task was wrought,
Alone the battle fought;
Through that long strife her constant hope was stay'd
On God alone, nor looked for other aid."

THE GRANDEUR OF FAITH.

Of all the principles which lie at the foundation of victory, Faith is the grandest and the most successful. This is seen in commerce and in trade, in education, in science, and in art. Witness the discovery of new worlds by the astronomers; of new continents by travelers; the triumphs of the steam-engine and the electrical telegraph and the railroad. To what are we indebted for these marvellous achievements but to the mighty principle of faith—faith in action by the hand of man? Franklin never would have grown famous in the eighteenth century, but for his faith in the hidden powers of electricity. His sure and safe induction from facts, and his eager fondness for knowledge, led him to chain the lightning and to imprison it in bottles. The savants of France laughed at the suggestions of the "ignorant provincial," and refused to print his papers in their transactions; but through faith he overcame them, and conquered the world to his new science. Professor Morse conceived the idea of the electrical telegraph as early as the year 1832. But to perfect the machinery to convey so subtle a fluid, to adjust and invent his method of writing, required long years of patient toil. His labors were regarded as visionary, and were received with doubt or ridicule; but he never lost faith either in its power or the final results. And now the world is girdled with the telegraph-wires, and we talk with our neighbors, the antipodes, night and day.

Cyrus W. Field—"the Franklin of ocean electricity"—by faith, spanned the bed of the telegraphic plain, that Lieutenant Berryman examined and sounded, between Newfoundland and the coast of Ireland. Though the cable in 1857 broke, his faith did not fail him. It was tried again in 1858, through the heroic perseverance of Field; but the iron web parted again, after encountering the most terrific storms, and at the risk of immediate death to all on board. A thousand dangers seemed to threaten the mysterious thread; but Field was never discouraged. His faith saved him, and bound two worlds together in all the future. "The first important message that came over the cable gave glory to God, and promised peace and good-will to men." Both continents were filled with joy and exultation; but gloom and disappointment soon spread over the world at the death, the slow and certain death, of the electric cable. Men believed

that the momentary union of the two continents, and the flash of intelligence between them, was all delusion or a fraud. Instantly the world was full of the rankest infidelity, the boldest skepticism, in regard to the Atlantic telegraph. The Voltaires, the Bolingbrokes, the Tom Paines, of science and of art, were filled with derision, and denounced the whole scheme as visionary and impracticable. If they had lived in the days of Columbus, they would have been the last to have believed in the existence of such a continent as America. It was only after two more conflicts of faith with the most stupendous difficulties, that the victory was achieved by Cyrus W. Field.

ITS IMPORTANCE IN RELIGION.

It must not be considered strange that faith should occupy such an important place in religion, inasmuch as we see its efficiency in the world of mind and of art. How much has Christianity lost, in relation to its conquests, by the substitution of other principles for this one, or by dethroning it in favor of animal feeling, or putting it beyond the reach of human attainment! It is simply because of its universality and efficiency in all that appertains to the world of art and to human progress in society, that God has made use of it to accomplish the grand designs of his moral government in the regeneration of the world. It is not a new principle, arbitrarily brought into the region of the supernatural, and forced to do a work simply because of its appointment, and not because of its native fitness; it is a law of our being as old as the race, and has been at work in all the history of the past. No matter what name it has had, it has always done its appointed work. On the great battle-fields of the world, in every department of human society, and in every age of the world, its power has been felt. Whatever is not of faith, is not only "sin" in religion, but it is a false and empty thing in science and in art. The law of faith in religion is the law of faith in society, and as all-pervading as the law of gravitation in nature.

THE WISDOM OF ITS APPOINTMENT.

In nothing is the wisdom of the Divine Legislator more seen than in placing this great principle at the basis of all that is contemplated in the conversion and salvation of the world; and in nothing is his benevolence more strikingly illustrated, inasmuch as it places all men

on the same level, and brings within their reach the "common salvation." If God had been a "respector of persons," he would have selected some recondite principle, only attainable by a favored few, as the ground of acceptance. He would have thrown around it insuperable barriers, to baffle any attempt beyond the arbitrary limits he had prescribed. The sovereignty of God is seen in the objective side of the system of redemption, and in the domain of the supernatural. Its origin, the procuring cause, the meritorious ground of our acceptance, and the establishment of the Christian religion, afford ample scope for its full and legitimate exercise. But on the ground of human responsibility, in the exercise of reason and judgment and will, God has been most careful not to trench upon, or to interfere. In all matters in which men are competent to act, they are left perfectly free and untrammelled. The demonstration for the truth of Christianity, as seen in the resurrection of Christ, is not only a miracle of the highest order, but a great religious fact, and a part of the Gospel message; as such, it is addressed to our reason and judgment, and is brought within the proper domain of faith. No one can doubt the important bearing it had on the conversion of the first hearers of the Gospel of Christ. They preached "Jesus and the resurrection." Paul says, "If thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." The testimony in favor of the resurrection of Christ is most full and satisfactory. It is all that can be asked. Indeed, heaven and earth, angels and men, friends and foes, all bear witness to it. The descent of the Holy Spirit from the heavens on the day of Pentecost, with the gifts he imparted from the ascended Savior, were the crowning testimonials to this great fact. Why have we this wonderful array of evidence, if not to reach the understanding, and produce an intelligent conviction in the mind that Jesus is the Son of God with power, as proven by his resurrection from the dead? If faith in the Gospel of Christ is an act of omnipotence, a miracle, an arbitrary appointment, the proofs of the resurrection are unmeaning, and the logic of the Gospel without any legitimate and just relation to human responsibility. The preaching of this great fact was a most prominent matter in apostolic times. Peter constantly appeals to it before the people and the Jewish Council.*

* Acts ii, 32; iii, 15; iv, 30.

The apostles were witnesses of the resurrection of Jesus, and so also was the Holy Spirit, whom God had given to those who obeyed him. While the fact of the crucifixion, like a barbed arrow, pierced the consciences of those who had been the betrayers and murderers of the Lord Jesus, the fact of the resurrection carried conviction to their minds that he was the Messiah, the Son of the living God.

The apostolic message was addressed to the common faith of men, not to some strange and recondite principle. It was to be the Divinely appointed means of conversion and salvation. It was never supposed, or hinted at in any of their discourses, that their hearers could not believe the message brought to them. They were rather condemned for their indifference to and neglect of it. Whatever means were necessary to produce faith, were to be found in the Gospel as preached by the apostles, or inseparable from it. To resist the truth, was to resist the spirit of truth. To refuse to acknowledge Jesus to be the Son of God, was to attempt to place God in the attitude of "a liar." And to refuse submission to the anointed Lord, was to reject the only name under heaven given or known among men whereby they could be saved.

HUMAN RESPONSIBILITY.

Jesus complains of his disciples for their want of faith. "Why are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?"* He speaks in commendation of the faith of the centurion.† He marvels because of the unbelief of men, and upbraids them in consequence of it. He could not do many of his mighty works in certain places, because of their unbelief. This language evidently places the responsibility upon man, and not upon God; on the creature, and not on the Creator. Why complain of the little faith of the disciples, when by the Spirit it could have been greatly enlarged? And why does he commend the faith of the centurion, if it did not depend upon him for its exercise? And why marvel at the unbelief of certain persons, when he knew that the power was withheld which could have removed it? And, still further, why upbraid them because of their unbelief, if there was no guilt resting upon them for this state of mind? If there is any meaning in language, the parties spoken of in these and similar portions of Scripture are justly held responsible, both for their faith and unbelief.

*Matt. viii, 26.

†Matt. viii, 10.

It is at this point that men are held accountable to God, under the Gospel of his Son. Faith is the turning-point that leads to pardon or condemnation, to heaven or to hell. It is the crucial question that decides the fate of every one to whom the Gospel is preached. There should be no uncertainty or doubt in relation to the ground upon which the exercise of so important a principle as this rests. The mind and conscience should be unembarrassed, in regard to the responsibility involved in it. If, after all the facts and testimonies of Scripture, this initial step can not be taken, without some irresistible operation of the Spirit above and beyond the control of the creature, then it is evident that the responsibility does not rest upon him; and whatever may be, in other respects, the ground of condemnation, it can not be consequent upon his unbelief. And yet the Savior says, "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world; and men have preferred the darkness to the light, because their deeds are evil." He again says, "If I had not come, and spoken to them, they had not sinned; but now there remains no cloak for them." The whole structure of the Gospel Message, its facts and testimonies, its commands and promises, its invitations and threatenings, is a recognition of man's responsibility, and his alone, for either its reception or rejection.

THE GROUND OF OUR FAITH.

We shall now state on what ground the Scriptures have placed the exercise of faith, so far as the sinner is concerned. In doing so, we shall not only refer to the New Testament, but also to the Old. It is evident that there can be no difference between the faith of the patriarchs and the Israelites, and that of Christians. The objects of faith may be different, but the principle is one and the same. The letter to the Hebrews will furnish all the examples needed, so far as the Old Testament is concerned. It is said, "Through faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God."* This faith rests upon the Mosaic account given us in the Scriptures, in relation to the work of creation.† It is simply confidence in the truth of the statements here made upon this subject. It is not upon the deductions of human reason, nor upon any philosophical or scientific basis, that we have reached our conclusions in regard to it; but

* Heb. xi, 3.

† Gen. i, 1.

upon the testimony of God's word. No one will say that faith in the Mosaic account of creation is dependent upon any special operation of the Spirit; and yet it is faith in one of the grandest acts, or series of acts, made known to the mind of man. So dependent are we upon testimony for the exercise of faith, that where the Bible is not known, or its traditionary revelations are not received, neither the being of God, as the Creator of the heavens and the earth, nor the fact of the universe having been brought into existence by his word, is known or acknowledged. Faith in the creation of the physical universe by the will of God, as expressed by his Word, stands associated with many examples of its exercise as found in the Old Testament, and does not differ in its origin or essence from any one of them. No one will suppose that faith in the creation of the world by the word of God is a religious act, or that it is in any way connected with justification. It depends upon the same conditions as implied or expressed in every other case; namely, the testimony of God's word. There is no more mystery associated with it, in pardon or salvation, than in the case referred to. They both stand precisely on the same basis, and must belong to the same category. The examples of Abel, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Sarah, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and others, show that faith in every instance is the result of Divine testimony.

FAITH CONTENDING WITH DIFFICULTIES.

In all the instances specified in the Epistle to the Hebrews, it is faith contending with difficulties. They are the strongest instances that can be found in the Scriptures. The first verse in this chapter can hardly be called a definition of faith. The writer simply shows that faith is the ground of confidence we have for things hoped for, inasmuch as it gives reality or substance to them, to distinguish them from what is unreal, imaginary, or deceptive, and "the evidence of things not seen." It answers all the purposes of sense, as a principle of action. It is a convincing argument of the existence of things not seen; things not seen by us, but by others, and through them communicated to us. It is confidence in the veracity of the statements made to us; and upon this we act, as if we ourselves had seen and known what they have reported. Faith simply uses the eyes and ears, or senses of others, and accepts the result as true.

The only difference there can be in faith, is found in the object or objects. In all the cases reported in this chapter, in every form of persecution and danger, the power of faith in supporting the mind, and endowing it with courage and patience, is presented to the reader.

The same testimony that leads us to believe that the heavens and the earth were made by the word of God, that assured Noah that the earth and the atmospheric heavens would be destroyed by a flood of waters, should lead us to believe in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of the living God.

The word of God is the only ground of evidence in every case. There were no sensible indications in the system of nature that gave assurance to Noah of the approaching flood. The course of nature was as uniform as it had ever been—the laws of nature as regular and steady—yet the flood came; and the only ground of confidence that Noah had of its approach, was the sure word of God; and upon this he acted, as rationally and firmly as if “all nature had given signs” of its coming. The apostle indeed uses this event to show the folly of infidelity, in relation to the flood of fire that shall one day wrap the earth in flames, at the second coming of the Lord Jesus.* Both events rest upon the same basis—the word of God. “For this they willingly are ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water and in the water. Whereby the world that then was, being overflowed with water, perished. But the heavens and the earth which are now, by *the same word* are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men.” There was no philosophy by which Noah could meet the objections of the old skeptics of his day; and there is none by which the Christian can meet the objections of unbelievers in our day. With him and with us, it is a simple matter of faith in God’s word. In neither case is it “a gift,” an irresistible operation of the Spirit, a mysterious influence, a miracle of grace. It is simply a reliance upon the word of God. This faith may at times be weak, defective, inoperative. The mind may be clouded with doubts, and invested with difficulties. But whatever may be the different phases under which it may exist, it is one and the same in principle and in fact.

*2 Peter iii.

THE OBJECT OF THE CHRISTIAN'S FAITH.

But what is the object of the Christian's faith? Certainly not the Five Points of John Calvin, nor the Thirty-nine Articles, nor the Longer or Shorter Catechism, nor the Philadelphia Confession, nor the "doctrines" of the creeds, nor any theories, true or false, ancient or modern. Nor yet is it an intelligent conviction of the truth of all that is found in the Bible, from the Book of Genesis to the last amen of the Revelations made to John in the island of Patmos. Not but what "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," and is "worthy of all acceptance." But no one is called upon to read, study, and master the whole of the Scriptures before he can become a Christian. This would be equal to "ascending to the heavens to bring the Christ down from above; or descending into the abyss, to bring him up again from the dead." Instead of this, "the word is nigh" us; "the word of faith," as preached by the apostles: "That if we shall confess with our mouth, that Jesus is the Lord; and shall believe in our heart that God has raised him from the dead, we shall be saved."*

The apostle John tells us that the miracles done by Jesus in the presence of the disciples, and recorded in his testimony, were designed to prove that he was the "Christ, the Son of God; and believing this, we shall have life through his name."† The written testimony of the inspired apostles is the ground of our faith. See the admirable and logical array of evidence given by the Savior himself, in support of his claims.‡ Paul and Barnabas "opened the door of faith to the heathens," by preaching the Gospel, and confirming it by signs following. Peter says that "the Gentiles by his mouth heard the word of the Gospel, and believed."|| Paul tells us that the Bereans "received the word with all readiness of mind, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so," as preached by Paul. "*Therefore, many of them believed.*" Of the Ephesian brethren, the apostle says: "After they had heard the word of truth, the Gospel of their salvation, they trusted in Christ; in whom also, after they believed, they were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise."§

In the memorable interview that Jesus had with his disciples at

* Rom. x, 8, 9. † John xx, 30, 31. ‡ John v, 31, 47. || Acts xv, 7. § Eph. i, 13.

Cæsarea Philippi, he laid the foundation element on which our faith was to rest in all coming time, and for all people; namely, that he was "the Christ, the Son of the living God."* Upon this rock he has built his Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. Our faith rests upon one who was dead, and lives again; who has the keys of death and of the unseen world. It is a faith trembling all over with life, instinct with all vital forces—a faith resting not upon a theory, but upon him who is the "living Word;" One who has "life in Himself;" the very fringe of whose garment, to the touch of faith, brought healing to the diseased. He had power to lay down his life, and to take it up again. His word has eternal life in it. It is quick and powerful. The winds and the waves heard it, and were hushed in silence. The heavens at his birth gave a new star to guide the wise men to his cradle, and the sun at high-noon became dark as Egypt at his death. Diseases of every name fled at his word, and demons in terror acknowledged his power. Death and the grave did homage to his scepter, and felt the potency of his word. At his resurrection, angels came to guard and attend him; and in his ascension they bore him to the ancient heavens from whence he came. He is now the anointed Lord of angels and of men. It is in him and upon him we believe; and, trusting in his mighty name, we enjoy salvation. Faith in him is the sum total, the grand result, of all we have read, heard, thought of, or known, in searching the Scriptures of truth.

ITS VICTORIES.

In the account which the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews gives of the men of faith under the Old Testament, the heroic element is largely disclosed. It is distinguished above all other elements existing, in the character of the righteous. "By faith, Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain." The younger brother had not the benefit of the example of the elder, if, indeed, of that of his father; and yet his faith in the word of the invisible One enabled him to triumph over sense and reason and inexperience, and led him to bring his "gifts to the altar," by which he obtained witness that he was righteous; "and by it he, being dead, yet speaketh." There was nothing in nature to help him. His faith lifted

* Matt. xvi, 13-20.

him up to a higher plane of thought than human reason had ever reached. It brought him in contact with all the elements of the true religion, under every economy—the altar, the sacrifice of expiation, and the priest. How grandly does the faith of Abel supply the want of experience, and fill up the void between the natural and the supernatural, the materialism of sense and the glories of the unseen! The case of Enoch, in some respects, is still more striking. He is presented to the reader in the Old Testament, as if he was the only man of faith in his generation and in the years that just preceded the flood; “faithful among the faithless, faithful only he.” He is the champion for the truth and the right, “when the wickedness of man was great on the earth, and every imagination and thought of his heart was only evil continually.” What an exceptional case is this! What a brilliant star amidst the gross darkness that rested on the people! What courage and manhood to withstand the deluge of iniquity which, like the coming flood, was sweeping every thing before it, in its abysmal depths of pollution! How calmly he “walked with God,” when all others forsook him! He would rather lay hold of the fringe of that “train that” afterward “filled the temple” of the Eternal, than to trust in princes. His faith made him greater than all the “giants in the earth” which were “in those days,” “and the mighty men of renown which were of old.” No wonder that “God took him” among the immortals, without tasting the bitterness of death, inasmuch as his faith had given him the privilege of becoming their peer. The same elements of character, in addition to others equally as decisive, are seen in the life and conduct of Noah, Abraham, and others spoken of in the same chapter. Indeed, in every case referred to, the courage and self-denial displayed render them sublime and worthy of all admiration. From these illustrations, and others found in the life of faith, as seen under the New Testament, the following facts will appear:

1. That the victories of faith are as old as the race; that they are seen not only in religion, but in science and in art, in peace and in war, in commerce and in trade, in temporal as well as in spiritual things; and that they are the grandest and most potent known on the earth.
2. The victory of self in each individual man who aspires after a better life, is due to the presence of this noble principle. It is the

triumph of virtue over appetite, of reason over prejudice, of truth over error, of fact over fiction, of the commandments of God over tradition, of the interests of the soul over the fascinations of pleasure and the bondage of the flesh. This is the victory, even our faith.

3. Whatever in religion is holy and sublime, in virtue amiable and great; whatever endows the soul with power to endure shame and reproach for truth and righteousness; whatever will enable one to meet with serenity the ills of life, and endure them with patience to the end,—is due to the presence of this triumphant principle.

What Milton says of the inspired "songs found in the law and the prophets," may be said of faith in God and in his Son. It will "allay the perturbations of the mind, and set the affections in right tune, to celebrate in glorious and lofty hymns the throne and equipage of God's almightiness—to sing victorious agonies of martyrs and saints, the deeds of just and pious nations, doing valiantly through faith against the enemies of Christ." "Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God?"

VIII.—LETTER, SPIRIT, LAW, GOSPEL, WRITTEN LETTER.

FIRST, let me say that much confusion has been produced by writing the word spirit with a capital S. In many places it has thus been made to represent the Holy Spirit.

No little confusion has been caused by the use of the word *letter*. If we could once know that there is no *letter* in the New Testament, we should free ourselves from confusion of thought. The term *gramma*, rendered by the term *letter*, is limited to the Ten Commandments. Now, as the apostles were ministers of spirit, not of letter; as they were ministers of a New Covenant, not of the Old,—then, apodictically, there can be no *letter* in their ministration. Hence, to speak of the “letter of the New Testament,” is not to speak as Paul speaks. There is a distinction between *gramma* and *graphie* (letter and scripture). It is nowhere said that scripture kills. Letter, the Ten Commandments, kills. This term *gramma* (letter) arose out of the fact that the Ten Commandments were written, engraved in stone, by the finger of God; and they are called *gramma*, that which was written or engraved, *kat, exocheen, par excellence*.

The reason why the New Covenant is called spirit, is found in the fact that it gives life; for life is given by spirit. Indeed, we can not conceive of life as existing *per se*. We must think of it as proceeding from spirit; and then, spirit proceeds from a person who is himself the Spirit. Thus we are told, in the seventeenth verse of the third chapter of 2 Corinthians, that the Lord is the Spirit. The New Covenant is of the Lord, the Spirit, and is spirit—not a body of written commandments—and, as such, it gives life. “The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came through Jesus Christ.” Now, as the Lord is the Spirit, that which comes through him is spirit.

It is obvious to the reader of Paul, that he uses the term *pneuma* (spirit) frequently in the sense of the term Gospel. The New Covenant is spirit, so is the Gospel. If I should say that the Gospel is not law, I should be understood. The Gospel is spirit. Then, law is not spirit. Law is letter.

That passage (1 Tim. iii, 16), "He who was manifested in flesh, was justified in spirit, seen by angels," etc., has been much abused by having the article "the" put before the term spirit, and the term spirit written with a capital S. The words, *in spirit*, denote the state in which Jesus was after his resurrection, no longer *in flesh*. So that he is now the Lord, the Spirit. That which comes to us through him is grace, truth, spirit, because he is the Spirit. The man Moses could do nothing more than write laws; and he was the man Moses, not the Lord, the Spirit. The man Christ Jesus is the Lord, the Spirit.

The Old Covenant was a body of commandments, the New Covenant has not a law nor a commandment* in it. Hence, those who are under it, are not under law, but under grace. Letter or law kills; hence so much of death in the land. This by the way.

While it is true that in the New Testament we have no *letter*, we have therein the real spirit of some things contained in the letter. Paul speaks of the Jew who, through letter and circumcision, was a transgressor of law. Let me say that the words "letter and circumcision" are a hendiadys for "literal circumcision." There was, then, a circumcision, of which that according to the letter or law was an outward sign. Circumcision in heart was intended. So an uncircumcised Gentile, if he kept the law, was better than a Jew who, though circumcised, transgressed the law.

Hatred is of the essence of murder. Hence, he that hates his brother is a murderer, whether he ever commit the overt act or not. He that looks on a woman to cherish desire, has already committed adultery with her in his heart. The last of the Ten Commandments contains the spirituality of the whole. It aims at the root of all evil—desire. Thou shalt not desire (*epithumeeseis*) any thing that is thy neighbor's. Paul takes this one as containing the spirituality of the whole (see Rom. vii), and says that he died under it; that is, that he was condemned by it. But the spirit is not letter. The apostles ministered spirit, and this takes out of the heart all evil desires, and implants love to God and love to the neighbor. These obviate any necessity for law.

Lastly, Jesus Christ is not a Lawgiver, but he is THE TEACHER. Faith and love are immutable principles; yet faith and love are both

* See New Covenant in Heb. viii, 10, 11, 12.

blind. Jesus becomes to the believer the way in which he should walk, the truth which he should accept, the life which makes him alive. So, then, he that believes in Jesus is at no loss for a way, nor for truth, nor for life. Jesus reveals all the counsels of God to the believer. Whatever is true, beautiful, good, holy, righteous, pure, is found by the believer in Jesus. Jesus says, "Believe in God, believe also in me." God says of Jesus, "Hear him." Jesus says, "Learn of me." So, then, faith and love embrace the whole of what is required of man. It is impossible to please God without faith, and nought that we can do is accepted without love. (See 1 Cor. xiii.)

But some one will ask, Does not the Savior say that the law is good? Does not Paul say the same? Yes. Nor do I deny it. But when a man replied to the Savior, that for one to love God with the whole heart, mind, soul, strength, and the neighbor as himself, was more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices, Jesus said to him, "Not far art thou from the kingdom of God." And Paul says the kingdom of God is righteousness, joy, and peace in the Holy Spirit. It has been well observed that those to whom the Ten Commandments were given, must have been in a moral condition exceedingly low. Yet there is need of law; for some men will never rise above it. I believe that law is good, and that it should be enforced in all instances in which it is violated. There are rogues of all sorts, and "Thou shalt not steal" belongs to them. There are liars, defamers, slanderers; and such should have the full benefit of the law. There are men who can never comprehend that which is true, beautiful, and good; and such should be put under the law, and kept under it until they have gained some moral shape. Paul said to the Jew (Rom. ii, 20), that he had *morphosis* (a forming, training) on the part of knowledge and truth in the law; that is, that the knowledge and truth in the law were given to train and form, or fashion, him into some moral condition. Notice, that the word is not *morphee* (form) but *morphosis*: so that the law is the rudimental instruction in morals, and was designed to give moral shape to those under it. The teaching which Jesus gives is *teleosis*, the completion of moral excellency. Paul treats this subject as Paul alone could do it. He tells us, in his Epistle to the Romans (vii) that law was *agathos* (good); but to work out *to kalon* (the beautiful) he found not. The law, then, was *agathos* (good) and the fruit of the law in conduct was *kalon* (beautiful). So

God is *agathos* (good), and all his works *kalon* (beautiful). See Gen. i. For in each instance in which we have, in the common version, "God saw that it was good," the Greek of the Septuagint has *hoti kalon* (that it was beautiful). So, also, the tree is good, and the fruit *kalos* (goodly, beautiful). But the teachings of Jesus present to us all that is true (he is Truth) and beautiful and good in perfection.

Therefore, let no one think that I am against law; far from it. An honest disciple of Jesus needs not any law; for Jesus is his teacher, and he has the spirit of Jesus in him. Those who have the spirit of Jesus, love Jesus, and walk as Jesus walked. *Honest men do n't steal.* Good men produce beautiful conduct. Upright men neither *creep* nor *crawl*. Still, there are many that need law to give them some moral shape. I say, let them have it. And I have no doubt that all Christians will say, Amen.

There is, however, what is called *grammata* in the Old Testament, and also in the New. This plural form we call *writings*. Now, it has grown into a custom to speak of these writings as letter; that is, as what is written. There is a passage in the "Prolegomena" of Tischendorf which has the expression, *scriptæ litteræ* (written letter). This I will transcribe in his Latin, with a free version for the English reader:

"Ut enim taceam, satis enim per se clarum est, primorum temporum homines quippe plenos spiritu atque ipsorum apostolorum fructos commercio alienos fuisse a litteræ Scriptæ venaratione, eoque minus jurasse in literam quo minus auctores ipsi aut orationis artem profiterentur aut iis quæ foras darent summam auctoritatem tribui valuissent," etc.

(That I may not mention a fact, sufficiently evident of itself, that men of the former times, full of spirit, and having enjoyed intercourse with the apostles themselves, were far from venerating the written letter, and had sworn to the letter so much the less, by how much the less the authors themselves professed the art of oratory, or wished the greatest authority given to those things which they published, etc.)

Here we find a solution for that perplexed question about varied readings. The men of former times had no great veneration for what is called the written letter; that is, they did not feel that they had sworn to, or were bound by, what they found written, so as to be

compelled to receive the words, *epea*, in the exact order in which they were found; if they preserved the *logous* (sayings of Jesus and the apostles), they were content. Let me illustrate:

Many are sadly disappointed when the thirty-seventh verse of the eighth chapter of Acts is found to be spurious. Such persons understand not the spirit of the apostles, nor that of the former times. Truth is not confined to the *written letter*. It is too great for any one set form of words, *epeon*. Hence, we have no set form of words for a confession of Christ. Jesus may be confessed as the Messiah, as the Son of God, as the Holy One of God, as the Risen One, as He that comes. I have three Testaments lying by me: the Sinaitic, Codex A, and B, or Vaticanus. In John vi, 69, Codex A gives Peter's words thus: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Cod. Sin. and B give: "Thou art the Holy one of God." In this, the *written letter* fails, but the spirit remains sure. What if we lose the last twelve verses of Mark? No one versed in the readings of manuscripts, and of the Fathers, feels that any thing is lost. The written letter was not venerated, but the spirit was venerated. The varied readings are themselves full of spirit. Instead of losing any thing by them, we gain at least this—that which the men of those times supposed to be true; and their understanding is worthy of being considered. Jesus, the Lord, the Spirit, is found abundantly in all the manuscripts; and he that looks for the Spirit will surely find it. Varied readings are like spots in the sun—they do not destroy it, nor do they hinder its light or heat. So these readings can not affect the light which Jesus gives. Legalistic, ritualistic spirits will find something to be grieved at and to mourn over; but men who seek for Jesus as the Lord, the Spirit, see nothing to be grieved at in the varied readings.

It is a remarkable fact that the apostles gave no directions with regard to the preservation of their writings, if we except the Book of Revelation. Such being the fact, we need not wonder that there was not the veneration for the *written letter* which some of our day have, or profess to have. We have often heard men talk of the inspiration of the Bible, and claim inspiration for each word. If such men will tell us what words the apostles used, then we might be disposed to listen to them. There are three Greek terms, *epos*, *logos*, *rhema*. The apostles have made no use of *epos*, save in one place (Heb.

vii, 9) ; *logos* and *rhema* constantly occur. "*Logos* never means a *word* in the grammatical sense, as the *mere name of a thing*, like *epos* and *rhema*," says Liddell and Scott, "but rather as the thing referred to ; the material, not the formal part."

A most important distinction, this ; and one that will forever put to rest that unquiet feeling with regard to variations in texts, manuscripts, and versions. The whole Gospel of Luke is a *logos* (word, treatise, history). So is the Book of Acts. Matthew's Gospel is a *logos* (word, or history). So is each Gospel. We have, then, beyond all cavil, the *logoi* (words, histories, treatises, narrations) concerning Christ ; but no man can say that we have the exact *epea* (mere word-forms) as originally penned by the apostles. We have the spirit, as ministered by the Holy Twelve, and this beyond all possibility of dispute.

It is a thing that would much aid the faith of the seekers after spirit, could we have a version of each manuscript. If the Lord will, I intend giving not only a version of the text of Tischendorf, but each varied reading of the three manuscripts above named. This will exhibit at once how greatly the men of the former times venerated spirit, and not the *written letter*.

IX.—THE ATONEMENT.

THE number of the *QUARTERLY* for July, 1872, contains a paper on this confessedly intricate subject. The present paper is not written in reply to that, or as a criticism on it, but with a view to provoke further discussion of the topic.

The common method of investigation is to accept the death of Christ as an absolute necessity in the salvation of man, and fit every thing else to it. The method proposed by the writer is to account for the phenomenon. The death of Christ is the phenomenon; why did he die? the problem for solution.

God has provided a plan of salvation for the race. We know of no other chance of salvation; so that, so far as we know, no man can be saved without it. The central thought in this plan is Jesus Christ; upon him rests and depends the whole:—the death of Christ an essential fact, an indispensable pillar in the plan; so much so, that without it none may be saved. Thus far we have given the popular, if not the universal, view of the followers of Christ. What is the picture now presented for us to look upon? Truly, one calculated to excite our wonder, and arouse within us a spirit of inquiry. It is the innocent suffering for the guilty; and this is an essential feature or element in the plan. We have a race of sinners, every one guilty and under condemnation; but, instead of punishing them, God brings forward an innocent victim to bear all the punishment. This may speak of God's love for men and mercy toward them; but what of his love and mercy for the victim? Let us notice here some views which have held sway, and are by some still entertained.

God is supposed to be very angry with man, and determined to slay him. Nothing but blood will appease his anger. He raises his sword, frowning with vengeance, and strikes the blow intended to annihilate the race, but Jesus steps in and receives it. Where, now, is that justice which demands that every man shall be rewarded according to his works? This was a deadly injustice to Christ, and no less an injustice to the guilty race, neither receiving what they deserved. Another, and perhaps, at the present time, more popular

view is often represented in discourses on the Atonement, and in our pulpits, by the following illustration: A certain king, much annoyed by the frequency of a certain crime among his subjects, issued a decree that the first one in his kingdom found guilty of this crime should lose both of his eyes. His own and only son was the first transgressor. Now the king is in a strait. If he does not preserve his word inviolate, his subjects will no longer regard his word, and the honor of the throne will be tarnished. On the other hand, his father's heart pleads for the son. The time arrives for the infliction of the penalty. The people are gathered together, and anxious expectation sits upon every countenance. The king with his son, and the officer to execute the sentence, appear before the waiting multitudes, and the king commands first, "Put out an eye of the criminal;" and when it is done, submits himself to the officer, and has one of his eyes plucked out.

The illustration is wholly inapplicable and unjust. Indeed, a greater perversion of justice has seldom been witnessed or attempted. In the first place, the king did not keep his word, and his subjects could not feel secure in his promises for the future. His own son, the criminal, would understand that if he disobeyed again, only half of the penalty would be inflicted. Suppose a jury impaneled to try one charged with an offense against the laws of our Commonwealth. They hear the case, and find him guilty, and bring in a verdict of guilty. Every body says he is guilty. The criminal himself pleads guilty. The jury now decides that the penalty shall be ten years' imprisonment and labor in the State-prison; but, instead of sending him there for ten years, they catch up an innocent party, and send the two for five years. This fills the measure of the above illustration. How much of justice or mercy is there in it? Or suppose the innocent party of his own free-will offers himself to serve out half the time, bear half of the penalty, and the jury accept him, and give sentence accordingly—is it just? Will not the ends of justice be defeated?

Let us return, now, to the strict and absolute necessity in the case, and propound the query: Why was it necessary for Christ to die? A strange spectacle is now presented. An omnipotent Being under a necessity—a just and omnipotent Being under the necessity of causing the innocent to suffer for the guilty! Such a

necessity—who can receive it? I find myself under the necessity of denying this, however strong the bonds of early and popular teaching. It was not *necessary* for Christ to die to save sinners. God could have saved sinners—all sinners—without the death of Christ; otherwise he is shorn of his omnipotence. The wrath of God must be lost sight of. Jesus did not suffer because God was angry, and thirsting in his fierce wrath for blood. With this view, one might regard Jesus as a benefactor, and feel grateful for the sacrifice made; but how will he regard God? How, indeed, but as an insatiate monster? No feeling of love or of gratitude will spring up in the heart of man redeemed, toward the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, viewing the atonement thus. “For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” (John iii, 16.) How different this from those old cruel theories! If God gave his Son to save me, because he had to do it, because the stern necessities in the case required it, no feeling of gratitude is awakened in my mind, or of love to him for the gift. But when the heaven-born and sublime thought flashes across my mind, God so “loved” you that he gave his Son to die for you, then every generous impulse of my whole being is aroused, and my heart goes out to him in joyous response for his great love.

Denying that the death of Christ was a necessity, what solution of the great mystery can be given? Why did Christ die? Why prepare salvation at so great a cost? We will attempt to solve this problem. The history of God's dealings with man is the history of an effort to win man to a life of righteousness, and an end which shall secure salvation—not an effort to compel him to turn to God, or to remain with God, but to induce him willingly to submit to the Divine government. In every age God has held open the door of salvation, and invited men to enter; ever offering inducements to lead him, never compelling. In every age man has been slow to accept. The ever-present things and allurements of life, upon which he looks and to which he listens, absorb his time and attention; and only a few rise above them, and seek the true riches. The great task was not to prepare a way of escape, but to induce men willingly to accept the salvation. Man's salvation depends upon his acceptance of the plan of God—his turning from sin to righteousness. His

acceptance depends upon the strength of the motive-power placed before him. God offers in the Adamic period his continued bounty; in the Noachian, salvation from the flood of waters; in the Jewish, present aid and power and possessions; in the Christian, he offers pardon and heaven. He proposes to win by love. A demand of our nature is to love those who love us. God shows us his love, and expects it to beget in our hearts love for him, and by this strong chord to draw man to him. The death of Christ, then, was not a necessity, but an exhibit of the love of God to man. Christ did not die to reconcile God to man, but to bring man to God. Every system that makes an effort to reconcile God to man must be false; for God has always been willing, and man the unwilling party. This position will be met with this argument: "No man can be saved without the blood of Christ, and his blood was shed in his death; *ergo*, the death of Christ was necessary." Admitted fully, that none can be saved without the blood of Christ, etc.; but this necessity exists because it is God's plan to save sinners through, or by, the blood of Christ. It does not prove that God saves sinners by the blood of Christ, because he could save them in no other way. Again: "Without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." True; but was it because God could not remit sins without the shedding of blood, or because it is his plan to remit through the shedding of blood? Let us not limit Omnipotence, or set bounds around God.

[This is admitted simply as a phase of theological theorizing, and must not be accepted as approved or indorsed.—EDITOR QUARTERLY.]

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*The Book of Genesis*. The Common Version, Revised for the American Bible Union, with Explanatory Notes. By THOMAS J. CONANT. New York: American Bible Union. 1873.

THIS new edition of Dr. Conant's "Revision of Genesis" (issued originally in 1868), has been occasioned by the adoption of the Book of Genesis as the subject of the Uniform Sunday-school Lessons for the first six months of the present year. There has been an immense demand for helps specially adapted to its study, on the part of Sunday-school superintendents, teachers, and pastors all over the land; and there are half a dozen or more different Commentaries on the market together, attempting to supply it. But, among them all, we consider this one of the very best, and cordially recommend it to the favorable consideration of pastors and Sunday-school workers, who are giving special application for the first time to the study of this Book in consecutive order. The notes are brief and pointed, and will usually be found to contain a reasonable and intelligent view of the passage, such as the popular understanding can readily fathom. The author has displayed fine judgment in avoiding all critical discussions, and in giving us the results rather than the processes of his closet study. Of the translation we will not now speak, except to say that, to the student, there is this great advantage in a *new translation*, whatever may be its individual merits: that it helps to get the mind out of ruts, and often throws sudden and much-desired light on expressions and passages which, by *reason of familiarity*, had grown obscure to us. It gives a freshness and vividness to our conceptions of Divine truth to refract them, as it were, by passing them through a new medium. Of course, there is not in this work the profundity of erudition and research which characterizes *Lange*; nor is there displayed in it the polish and elegance of accurate scholarship of which the "Speaker's Commentary" is one of the best illustrations. There is, perhaps, scarcely hesitation enough in deciding upon novel interpretations, nor enough reserve in putting forward the individual opinion of the author, to insure for it permanent success and influence in

the *upper value* of Biblical learning; but for its present purpose it is admirably adapted.

The rendering of Genesis iv, 1, "I have gotten a man *with* Jehovah," seems to us faulty, not only in being unintelligible, but as failing to recognize in the name of Cain his mother's thought that he was, perhaps, the *promised Redeemer*, who should "bruise the serpent's head." This name seems the monument of the first mother's faith.

Again, in iv, 7, "Is there not if thou doest well a *lifting up*?" means nothing without a note to justify the rendering, which, after all, can only indicate obscurely that *acceptance* which is expressed in the common version. Again, in the same verse, we take exception both to the rendering of the next sentence and the note appended: "And if thou doest not well, *sin is crouching at the door.*" The note is as follows: "Sin (*the evil disposition* which beset him, and to which he was yielding) is personified as a *lurking beast of prey, ready to spring upon its victim* in an unguarded moment." Why should any commentator be ready to see here a flower of modern sentimental rhetoric rather than a spiritual parable, unveiling that divine idea for whose sake the whole Bible was written—the idea of redemption? What God says is, in effect, this: "You have been rejected, and your offering disregarded. Why? Because you lack faith, and your offering expresses none. Would I reject you if you had been 'doing well,' if you were 'without sin?' But if you are a sinner, if you 'do not well,' go get a 'sin offering.' One 'lies at the door;' bring that, and I will accept you." The word rendered "sin" is the same word, we are told, which is elsewhere used to express the *offering for sin*. And the same usage is found in the New Testament, as in 2 Cor. v, 21, where Christ is said to be "made sin for us." If Cain was already a sinner, sin would hardly be represented as waiting outside the door to seize upon him. In this instance, however, Dr. C. has followed the beaten path, and to his own disadvantage, as we think. The text is confessedly one of the most obscure in the Bible, and, in our opinion, demands that *ultima ratio* of the translator, the "analogy of the faith."

2.—*The Wars of the Huguenots.* By WILLIAM HANNA, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1873.

THE author of the "Life of Christ" is too well known to need any introduction, and his name upon a title-page is sufficient security that the work has merits of some kind. No one will be disappointed who reads this one. It is an admirably compact little 16mo volume of three hundred and forty-four pages, which yet contains just what every body wants to know about this very interesting epoch in French history. Of course, it is a mere epitome; but it has merits which are seldom found in such works.

We have seen no book recently which had so much and such exceedingly good *character-painting* in it. The reader is not smothered with dates and diplomatic and military details; but the *persons* who were the conspicuous actors in the great drama are drawn with a vividness and a boldness which is rarely equaled. The sketch of Admiral Coligny is very fine; a character whom Macaulay might have added to his list of great generals, consummate masters of the art of war, who seldom, if ever, won a battle. Catherine di Medici and Charles IX are better and more life-like portraits than either Motley or Froude has given. This is high praise, but it is well earned. Henry IV occupies, as he deserves, more space than any other character in the volume; but while he is made a most real and life-like personage, and all his geniality and wit, his generosity and magnanimity of nature, are portrayed so appreciatively as to brighten our already high estimate of him, the masterpiece of the book, as we think, is the delineation of his mother, Jeanne d'Albret.

France is the land of great women. We might truly say that she owes less to the valor and devotion of her sons than to the wit and courage and spirit of her daughters. And of all the long line of illustrious women who have brightened her annals, the noblest and worthiest and most heroic, in our opinion, was Queen Jeanne of Navarre. While they two lived, life was a perpetual duel between her and Catherine di Medici. No contrast could be greater than that between these two. The Queen Mother was an Italian, full of craft and wiles, infinite in resource, and unscrupulous in her choice of means. Half a dozen times her skill in diplomacy paralyzed the armies of the Huguenots when she was on the brink of ruin. Jeanne had no resources except her honest purpose and intrepid spirit, and yet she was the one person whom Catherine could neither bend nor break; her she could never deceive nor intimidate.

In illustration of her courage and eloquence, we quote a portion of her reply to Cardinal d'Armagnac, who, being Papal Legate in Southern France, had addressed her a monitory letter, couched in very plain terms:

"You request me not to think it strange, nor to take in bad part what you have written. Strange I do not deem your words, considering of what order you are; but as to taking them in bad part, that I do as much as is possible in this world. You excuse yourself, and allege your authority over these countries as the Pope's legate. I receive here no legate at the price which it has cost in France. I acknowledge over me in Béarn God only, to whom I shall render account of the people he has committed to my care. As in no point I have deviated from the faith of God's Holy Catholic Church, nor quitted her fold, I bid you keep your tears to deplore your own errors, to the which act of charity I will add my own, putting up at the same time the most earnest prayer that ever left my lips, that you may be restored to the true fold, and become a faithful shepherd instead of a hireling. I must entreat that you will use other language when next you would have me believe that you address me, impelled, as you affirm, by motives of respect; and, likewise, I desire that your useless letter may be the last of its kind."

- 3.—*Studies in Poetry and Philosophy.* By J. C. SHAIRP, Principal of the United College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1872.

THIS volume contains four essays on Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keble, and The Moral Motive Power, which originally appeared in the pages of the late *North British Review*. To those familiar with the broad and liberal culture which was characteristic of that northern star of literature (which so suddenly and unaccountably disappeared from our view a year or two since, leaving a void as yet unfilled), it may appear sufficient praise to say that these essays, in their literary finish and perfection of style, to say nothing of their insight and critical acumen, are worthy to have marked an epoch in the history of that journal. They are among the best of the best class of papers on Critical Biography (we speak of the first three), which have given our later and higher periodical literature a distinction of its own. They are as far as possible removed from Philistinism. They are the perfection of "sweetness and light." We instance the essay on Keble. Nothing could be more charming, by its perfect transparency and freedom from all partisan bias on a subject on which a dispassionate jury of twelve men could scarcely be found in the British isles, than the discernment, kindliness, and sympathy with which he traces the origin and early progress of the Oxford movement. Principal Shairp is a Scotch Presbyterian, and yet, to his glowing admiration and affectionate regard, John Henry Newman is scarcely less than a prophet, and the author of "The Christian Year" is more than *vates sacer*—he is an inspired psalmist, worthy, from his own saintliness of character, to sing the sweetest lyrics to which the Church of God has listened since our English speech was framed. On Keble the English people have conferred an honor unexampled since the Reformation. As a monument to his memory, they have built a College, at Oxford, and called it by his name. The saintliest character, combined with the highest poetic nature the English Church has produced, are worthy of such recognition; but his worthiest and most lasting monument is "The Christian Year."

-
- 4.—*The Song of the New Creation, and other Pieces.* By HORATIUS BONAR, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1872.

THERE are rich, sweet strains of devotional melody in this book, which are entirely characteristic of the author, although the larger part of it consists of rather commonplace prose, spoiled in the effort to put it into rhyme. A sermon which should contain only such thoughts on religious subjects as the most of these, would be thought lacking both in originality and in power. The poem which gives its name to the book, is but a recasting of some of the most ancient hymns of the Church, to which it

adds not a single idea nor a single new expression. But there are shorter pieces which contain really fresh and beautiful adaptations of familiar religious ideas. We instance "The Purging of the Temple," "The Hidden Cross," "The Desert Rock," and "The Stone Rolled Away." The last of these but one is perhaps the best poem in the book. There is a vigor of rhythm and a beauty of expression in these lines, which are only a fair sample of its excellence:

"Rock of Eternity, to thee,
In thirst and weariness, we flee;
Thy waters can not cease to pour,
Their fullness is forevermore.
Let him that thirsteth come!

River of health, thy current pours
Its freshness on these leprous shores;
True Jordan, bidding all draw nigh
For health and immortality,
With 'whosoever will!'"

In "The Stone Rolled Away," there is a beautiful interpretation of the Resurrection, and an application of its comfort to the care and trouble of life:

"O, many and many a stone from us
Has thus been rolled away;
It seemed too vast for us to touch,
As o'er the gate it lay.

When we awoke at early dawn,
We said, with troubled heart,
Who shall roll back the ponderous stone,
Or bid our fears depart?

As we went forth we found, with joy,
The dreaded care had flown;

We saw no hand, we heard no voice,
And yet the stone was gone!

The stone forever rolled away,
The angel sitting there,
Were pledges of a heavenly grace
That banished all our care.

O, on how many an earthly grief
Or fear, a light unknown
Has, with a joyful suddenness,
In heavenly glory shone!"

On the whole, we doubt not that there is enough of real poetry and of true religious feeling in the book to float it. Dr. Bonar's old admirers—and they are wherever English hymns are sung—will gladly receive it as a token that the pure fountain, whence has flowed so much that is good and admirable in the past, is still unsealed.

5.—*Studies of Character from the Old Testament.* By THOMAS GUTHRIE, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1872.

As we write, there comes the sad tidings of Dr. Guthrie's death. To many in this country who have not made acquaintance with him through his books, he has been endeared as the editor of the *Sunday Magazine*, which, we rejoice to say, has been enjoying an increasing circulation on this side of the Atlantic. The *London Times* said of him some time ago, that he was the most eloquent man in England, and the eulogium is borne out by the testimony of these essays, as far as that may go. We can not say that there is any thing startlingly original or profound in them; indeed, we are glad there is not, for any thing startlingly original concerning the Old

Testament is most oft the startlingly untrue ; but there is a freshness and picturesqueness in the characters as he presents them, and the language he uses is very strong and noble. The articles are not prosy homilies of the kind which ordinarily cumber the shelves of Sunday-school libraries, but they are fine critical studies of the histories and characters of those old worthies "who, being dead, yet speak" from the pages of the old Scriptures. We venture to say that few persons will read the first of the series, entitled, "Abraham, the Friend of God," without enlarged and more satisfactory conceptions of this most illustrious character, and a feeling that things which we have always known we now know better.

6.—*Life of James Henderson, M. D., Medical Missionary to China.* New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1873.

THIS little work contains the memorials of the life of a brilliant and ardent young missionary, who sacrificed the brightest prospects of professional success at home, that he might "spend and be spent" in the service of Christ in a foreign land. It is evidently the compilation of his loving wife, left to an early widowhood after only three years of marriage, although her name nowhere appears in it. There is in it no story of more exciting interest than the same old story of martyrdom—the story of loving devotion and faith wherewith the friends of Christ in all ages have "counted it all joy" to suffer for His sake.

"For the love of his Lord, and to seek for the lost,
He fell like a martyr, he died at his post."

That is the summary of it, but it is well and briefly, as well as delicately and lovingly, narrated. It is full of interest of another kind too, affording evidence of the value of medical missions and their influence in spreading the Gospel. During the year 1864, the aggregate attendance at Dr. Henderson's hospital at Shanghai was nearly fifty thousand; often the out-door attendance was from sixty to three hundred daily. These multitudes were skillfully and efficiently treated, and the great majority healed, without money and without price, for the sake of Jesus of Nazareth, who himself went healing the sick while he preached the Gospel.

7.—*Robin Tremayne: a Tale of the Marian Persecution.* By EMILY SARAH HOLT. 12mo. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1873.

THOSE who prefer to take their history "sugar-coated" with fiction, may find entertainment in "Robin Tremayne;" but we can not imagine who else will. The author makes a persevering attempt to give a quaint and antique flavor to her story by putting phrases into their mouths which she has evidently "gotten up" by rummaging old books. The design is unusually silly and the effect an unusual failure.

We have chapters of dialogue after the following fashion; and we may say, *en parenthese*, that this is as sprightly as any thing we have seen in the book. We select at random:

"Mrs. Philippa," said Isoult, when she returned, "we will not be a charge on her ladyship. Jack and I will lie at the inn; for assuredly she can not lodge us all in this her house."

"I thank thee truly, dear heart," responded Philippa, affectionately. "In good sooth, there is not room for all, howsoever we should squeeze us together; wherefore we must needs disparkle us. Verily, an we had here but James and Nan, there were not one of us lacking."

Whether there are any new characters or any characters of any kind in the story, we really can not say. Our five wits are so continually "disparkled" by strange words and grotesque phrases, that we have no leisure to consider the plot or the characters. To look for characters would be like searching in a heap of old clothes to see whether there were any mèn or women concealed among them.

8.—*The Master's Home-Call*; or, Brief Memorials of Alice Frances Bickersteth.

By her father, the REV. E. H. BICKERSTETH, M. A. 18mo. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1873.

THERE are few who read this little book who will not be moved to a sympathy of grief with the gentle, tender nature of the devoted and gifted father by whom it is written. It is addressed to the "friends and companions in age of his child," and consists of a "Memorial Sermon" preached some two weeks after her death, and an Appendix containing several brief poems of hers (which serve to show how strong must have been the intellectual and spiritual sympathies between the poet-father and his gifted child), and a connected narrative of her last few months of suffering; with some fragmentary poems of his own, written for her in her sickness. The whole of the little memorial volume is indeed a poem, a "song of love and grief," worthy of the pious and tender harp of the sweetest religious poet of our day.

9.—*The Well in the Desert: an Old Legend of the House of Arundel.* By EMILY SARAH HOLT. 16mo. New York: Robert Carter & Bros. 1873.

ANOTHER fiction of the "historical" kind by the same author. This story is located in the fourteenth century, and is simply and well told. There is a tone of fervid Protestantism in all this lady's writings, which will commend them to many readers who want to know definitely and once for all which side an author takes, and then, if they approve the position, all demerits are overlooked. Of course, art suffers by any partisanship, and one can dislike Catholicism far too much for truth; and, in a book, art and truth are one.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*L'Intolérance de Fénelon: Etudes Historiques, d'après des Documents pour la plupart inédits.* Par O. DOUEN. (The Intolerance of Fénelon: Historical Studies after Documents for the most part unpublished. By O. DOUEN.) Paris: Sandoz & Fischbacher. 1872. 12mo. pp. 336.

FOR almost two centuries, the name of Fénelon has had a currency in the world as almost a synonym of religious forbearance, tolerance, and freedom. As is common in such cases, once give a name a strong impulse in a certain direction, and it increases from period to period in ever-accumulating force in that direction until, some day, some iconoclast in history, by newer and deeper and more discriminating inquiries into the hidden historical sources of the past, breaks the spell of this false reputation and veneration, and shows men that they have been long deceived into a blind idol-worship, that it was all a delusion. The "mild and gentle Fénelon," "the enemy of all constraint of conscience and religious persecution," are expressions long since familiar to the world; and it is almost like a sacrilege to attempt to break violently into this pleasant faith, and rob men—Protestants, Catholics, and indifferentists, alike—of this cherished delusion. Yet this our author has done, with a steady, bold, unsparing hand; and, surely, not without success!

What accounts for this high reputation of Fénelon, if not really sustained by the truth of history? We may suggest some causes:

The period of history in France in the midst of which Fénelon lived and acted, was one of general, fierce, bloody, unrelenting, and long-continued intolerance and persecution. It was the order and fashion and boast of the day, to be intolerant and actually persecuting. Any even apparent exception to this, *in any degree*, would stand forth with marked contrast. A man might still be intolerant and even persecuting; but if less than the general order of things, if he would demand any mitigation or relaxation, he would appear to Protestants and Catholics a *tolerant* man, *by comparison*. Again, a man's words and pretensions of "gentleness," "sweetness," "forbearance," "love," and the like, if constantly repeated and wide-spread, concealing and expounding his acts, however really these may belie his pretensions—especially if these words are sounded forth with skillful rhetoric and consummate art, and amid the charm of high places—will go very far to deceive the world. Both these things, we

confidently believe, were true of Fénelon. Furthermore, another most important fact is, the wickedly false use of words by the men, from the king, Louis XIV, down to the lowest of his minions, male and female, who played their parts in that bloody drama. *This* is, indeed, one of the most repulsive and accursed pages in that history. The choicest words of noblest meaning about freedom and Christian charity, etc., are continually, with the most delicate suavity, on the lips of all the great leaders in this awful persecution. The ingenuous mind becomes bewildered by the atrocity of this general hypocrisy and profanity. We can submit whole pages of the noblest, "sweetest" utterances from the most abominable of these persecutors, including always, of course, the king. Here is where one of the chief deceptions lies. This charge, alas! rests with crushing weight also upon Fénelon. His language, with the everlasting prating about "*douceur*" in it, is a masterpiece of artfulness; he wrote on Rhetoric, and was a master in it. This is one of the most painful things in Fénelon's character. Finally, the history of the chief actors in this drama has been mainly written by cunning Catholics, whose task it was to conceal the bad and deceive the world. By these men the documents have been skillfully handled, the darkest pages, the incriminating passages, suppressed. To this class belongs the history of Fénelon by Cardinal Bausset.

We are aware that Protestants have quietly allowed themselves to be *taught* the life of Fénelon by such men as Bausset, and have become eulogists of his hero. In the history of Protestantism in France, our day will reveal yet many things hidden before. The researches now made will, perhaps for the first time, bring this great dramatic history in its full truth before the world.

The book before us treats of Fénelon in his direct relations to Protestants. This embraces his history, first, as Superior of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*; and second, as Missionary in Saintonge. The conduct of Fénelon in these two positions occupies the principal part of the book—two hundred pages. The remainder is occupied with *Appendices*. These are: 1. The Remonstrances of the Clergy and the Revocation of Nantes; 2. List of the Recluses of the House of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*; 3. Two Episodes of the Revocation (1, the Pastor of the Desert, Givry; 2, the Pastor du Vigneau); 4. Letters of Fénelon, written from Saintonge; 5. Attempts at Fusion of Catholicism and Protestantism; 6. A Trap Laid by a Bishop for a Proscribed Pastor.

The *Nouvelles Catholiques* was an establishment in Paris—with branch institutions—under the special favor of the king, for Protestant ladies, "converted," or "to be converted" to the Catholic religion. Of this Fénelon was made the superior. The history of the *Nouvelles Catholiques* is one of the darkest pages in the atrocious history of Catholic perse-

cution of that day in France. The inmates were largely children, young girls, not seldom under ten years of age, taken violently from their parents, often by stealth; others were older, but seized by force, and incarcerated in these "retreats," as they were euphemistically called; they were really prisons.

Like all such institutions, the greatest care was taken to cover with the veil of dark secrecy the details of its inner history. Every one connected with these "retreats," from the superior to the humblest devoted familiar and menial, well understood this, and was faithful to his trust. But, in spite of all this care, many terrible facts inevitably reached public knowledge. Were all that happened within these mysterious walls revealed, what a terrible history we would read!

But let us cite some of these facts that have been brought into light from secret records and other sources. The *Nouvelles Catholiques*, according to the author of its *Constitutions* or *Regulations*, "was intended to furnish to young Protestant ladies, converts to the Church, or desiring to become such, a safe retreat against the persecution of their relatives, and against the artifices of heretics." One of its directors says that its inmates "found here, with joy, a retreat assured against the persecution of their relatives." How enormous, as usual, was the lying in these calm, sweet words, will appear from a few only of the facts we cite from the history of this delightful "retreat from persecution." And, first, we will show how these inmates were brought to the *Nouvelles Catholiques*. We cite documents of high authority.

The Marquis de Seignelay, on the part of the king, wrote to the lieutenant-general of police the following laconic orders:

"October 20, 1685.

"His majesty desires that you send and bring from Charenton, Magdeleine Risoul, and that you have her placed in the *Nouvelles Catholiques*."

The next is fuller:

"April 24, 1685.

"His majesty desires that you have placed in the *Nouveaux*, or *Nouvelles Catholiques*, those of children of the woman Rousseau, that are yet quite young; in these houses their board will be paid by his majesty, after you have informed me what is to be paid. With reference to the others who are of riper years, his majesty relies on you to induce them, by such means as you will think most proper, to be converted."

Mark, "relies on you"—the lieutenant-general of police—to induce them to be converted by means *you* may adopt! Nothing plainer than this. Here comes one of still plainer speech:

"January 24, 1686.

"The king knows that the wife of the man Trouillard, apothecary at Paris, and who is at present with the Duke and the Duchess de Bouillon, is one of the most stubborn Huguenots in existence. And, as her conversion may bring about that of her husband, his majesty desires that you have her arrested and taken to the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, according to the order which I here send you."

To facilitate these arrests M. de Harlay, *Procureur-General*, who, in the name of the law, presided over this work of forced conversions, asked of the Archbishop of Paris blank orders, signed by his reverence, to use at discretion :

"April 2, 1686.

"Monsieur,—I have only two or three of your orders to receive women into the convents left. I pray you to have the kindness to send me a dozen. I am," etc., etc.

The most terrible scenes occurred sometimes in these arrests of women. Even the very young sometimes resisted to the last, at the very doors of this "sweet retreat," with fury and cries of agony. Wives were torn from husbands; daughters, very often little children, from parents.

How free these "converts" were, is seen from some orders from the same high source. We cite only these, that the truth of these representations may not be doubted. Mother Garnier was Fénelon's co-operant subaltern in the *Nouvelles Catholiques*.

"THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO MOTHER GARNIER.

"February 12, 1686.

"The king orders me to write to you, that it is his desire that all the women or girls of the pretended Protestant religion, that may be placed in your house, shall receive no visits, nor even letters, that you have not seen before; and further, that those who have Catholic girls to wait on them, shall not be allowed to go to the parlor, nor to go out without being accompanied by one of the sisters of the community."

"February 17, 1686.

[After the same order forbidding all intercourse, as in the preceding, this note continues:] "His majesty has, besides, also been informed that some of the women refuse to hear the instructions that are offered to them. Wherefore, his majesty orders me to say to you, that you are to make known to those so refusing, that this conduct displeases him, and that he will not hesitate to take, in respect to these, such resolutions as will not be agreeable to them."

This last threat simply signified that they would be, as they often were, sent to the Bastille and other citadels, or even to the notorious *Hôpital General*, a receptacle of the vilest characters.

Some of these wretched prisoners—generally of eminent, often of noble, families—became insane by their imprisonment and maltreatment.

"Mademoiselle des Forges, daughter of Theodore Le Coq, a counselor and eminent man, was at first confined at the house of the Benedictines de la Madeleine du Tresnel, of which Fénelon was also superior, and then taken to the *Nouvelles Catholiques*. She would not even hear her keepers speak of religion. She was a lady of character, education, and talents. 'The treatment she received,' writes one of her relatives, de Beringhen, 'finally destroyed her reason and her life—she became insane.'

In this condition, her jailers made her sign a formula of abjuration of her faith. She was in this condition sent back to her family; scarcely arrived there, in 1687, this wreck of a once accomplished lady, threw herself from the third story of the house on the pavement. There lay the

palpitating remains of one of Fénelon's converts! Let posterity study this man in the face of this scene; he will meet it in the Great Day!

A noble lady, Madame de la Fresnaye, was arrested and placed in this same retreat, January 30, 1686. In less than three months, by reason of mental agony, loss of freedom, and persecution, she became insane. On the 4th of May, Seignelay sent this order to la Reynie:

"Mother Garnier has written to me that la dame de la Fresnaye, who is at the *Nouvelles Catholiques*, is insane, and that it is necessary to place her in confinement. The king desires that you examine to see if this is true, and that you let me know where she can be placed."

Where she was confined is not stated. But it is noteworthy that, according to a record in the state secretary's office, three years later she was banished, by an order dating November 21, 1689, from the kingdom, "unless she became converted." These cases of insanity are abundant. Space and the very horror of these recitals forbid us to continue them further.

And now, to the end of this terrible picture we only add, that Fénelon was the superior, the genius, all this time, of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*! And must we not regard it as a bitter irony—if it were not a most abominable hypocrisy—when we hear one of these sweet-tongued, rhetorical Catholic eulogists of Fénelon say:

"However ordinary, however common were the functions of Fénelon—in charge of the *Nouvelles Catholiques*—soon all admired the uncommon manner in which he fulfilled them, and the *Nouvelles Catholiques* became the theater of his glory and of his reputation."

Such is the gilded language of Father Querbœuf in his "Life of Fénelon."

We feel constrained to add one ray to this "glory." Nineteen ladies that he called "opiniâtres" (*obstinate*), he, "the gentlest of men" (*le plus doux des hommes, presque un saint*), "almost a saint," sent, for their obstinacy in not heeding his "eloquence, simple, noble, persuasive," into citadels, the Bastille, etc., where they were subjected to the treatment of State criminals. The sad list of these names is preserved, and it is also registered before a higher judge than Louis XIV! After long imprisonment, most of these noble women remained true to their faith, and were finally—ten of them—expelled from France. So much, too, for the truth of his wonderful, almost miraculous, success in converting.

As missionary in Saintonge, Fénelon reveals precisely the same character as superior of the *Retreats*—sweet words, ambition, craftiness, intolerance—the proofs of the most direct kind are superabundant, crushing.

Of Madame Guyon—his former intimate friend, who was, for her opinions, once shared by Fénelon, confined in the Bastille—this "gentlest of men" said: "I am willing that she shall die there, that we shall never see her again, and that we shall never hear any one speak of her again." And

elsewhere he says of her: "If it is true that this woman wanted to establish this damnable system [Molinism], *she ought to be burned* instead of giving her the communion, as Mons. de Meaux [Bossuet] has done." And yet Madame Guyon's error was only the teaching of an extravagant notion of mystical love to God! This was the cowardly palinode he sang for the ears of the king. In his old age, on the verge of the grave, he wrote thus of toleration:

"The Church must be ready to punish, in the most exemplary manner, all disobedience of indocile spirits. It must finally prefer God to men, and the truth, basely attacked, to a false peace, which will only serve to prepare a more dangerous trouble. Nothing would be more cruel than a cowardly compassion which would tolerate the contagion in the whole flock, where it daily grows without measure. In such an extremity we must employ, says Saint Augustine, *a medicinal rigor*, a terrible tenderness, and a severe charity. . . . 'The vigilance and industry of the shepherds,' says he, '*must crush the wolves*, wherever they show themselves.'"

By the wolves the "sweet Fénelon" designates the Protestants.

These are only *some few* of Fénelon's utterances, revealing the real intolerance of his spirit. He was never weary of lauding the "douceur," the "gentleness, and good-will" of Louis XIV toward his Huguenot subjects. In word and deed abundant, he invoked, permitted, and justified the use of cruel, persecuting force in the suppression of heresy and in the conversion of heretics.

Fénelon was an extreme Ultramontanist in doctrine, and an absolutist who, as St. Simon, his biographer, says, "insisted on being oracle; on ruling as master, without giving a reason to any body; on reigning directly, without control." "His spirit," says Nisard, "would brook no contradiction—was one thirsting for absolute control." Such was Fénelon!

2.—*Histoire de la Predication Protestante de langue Francaise du dix-neuvieme Siecle—1800-1866.* Par ALFRED VINCENT, *Pasteur*. (History of the Protestant Pulpit of the French Language, of the Nineteenth Century—1800-1866. By ALFRED VINCENT, Minister of the Gospel.) Geneva and Paris. 1871. 12mo. pp. 330.

It is certainly with unusual interest we greeted and read this book. No one, so far as we know, before M. Vincent, had undertaken the laborious and difficult task of giving any thing like a complete, satisfactory history of the Protestant French pulpit of the present century. This was certainly not because the subject itself had not sufficient merit or attractions, because there were not abundant and rich materials, or because the men for such a work were wanting among French Protestants.

It is only a century since men were publicly executed in France for the simple crime of preaching the Protestant religion; and the enormous mass of cruel laws against Protestant worship were unabished till near the

close of last century; that is, in the life-time of men yet living. The Protestant Churches in ancient France have had but little more than the present century of unmolested freedom. During these long, terrible years of bloody persecutions—the purpose of which was, as again and again declared in the royal edicts, utterly to extirpate the Reformed religion in France—no schools were allowed to Protestants (they were by law forced to Catholic schools), and especially none to educate their ministry; these had to go outside of France to prepare themselves for their work. So crushing were these persecuting measures, and so completely did the Government believe it had obtained its end, that it repeatedly announced, in public proclamations, that “the Reformed religion, so called, no longer existed in the kingdom.” It is most wonderful, then—perhaps without a parallel in modern ages—that there should have arisen among the Protestants in France a ministry of such numbers, and such intellectual culture and power, as this century, from the very beginning of it, has produced. But it must not be forgotten, that from the first days of the Reformation in France, and in spite of the apostasy of so many eminent Huguenot families following the apostasy of Henry IV, to the present day, Protestantism has numbered among its most devoted adherents many eminent families, and many of the noblest intellects in that country.

When the numerical strength and the material resources of Catholics and Protestants in France are compared, in spite of all the sad defects and the moral weakness of the Reformed Church in France, its ministry, its pulpit, is to-day incomparably superior to that of the dominant Church there, in moral and intellectual power, activity, and productiveness.*

The author of this book was, for years, professor in the Protestant Theological Seminary at Strasbourg, and is evidently a man well qualified for the task he has here proposed to himself. He seems also to have well understood the obligations of his work, and how only it should be done. In the Preface he says:

“The work which I now publish is the fruit of long years of reading and patient labors. I proposed it to myself since my retirement from the Faculty (in 1849). At first, my design was not to pass beyond the first half of this century. Retarded in my progress in a thousand ways, I took advantage of this delay to push my explorations beyond this limit. But, arrived at 1866, I perceived that the Protestant pulpit assumed a decidedly new physiognomy, entered into a period of renovation and transformation, which demanded, some day, to be studied as a subject by itself. It was time, therefore, for me to bring my work to a close.

“I do not know how this book will be received. I hope, however, that my readers will appreciate the extreme care I have taken to seek full information, to examine every thing closely; and will recognize that my investigation has been patient and conscientious. For myself, I am happy in believing that, in writing this ‘History of the Protestant Pulpit of the Nineteenth Century,’ in thus *fixing* the ideas of contemporary Protestantism, as far as concerns the *pulpit*, I have done a useful service to this noble Reformed Church,

* See De Pressensé's admirable book, *Du Catholicisme en France; Prosperité matérielle, Décadence morale*; especially ch. iii.

crowned with so much glory and honor by its sufferings in the past, and by its ardent search, in the present time, for all that can maintain its vitality and confer on it the right to arouse and direct the hearts of our countrymen."

The author divides the space of time traversed by him into three phases or periods: The first, from 1800 to 1820, he denotes the *Sleep*; the second, 1820-1850, the *Awakening*; the third, 1850-1866, *Liberalism*. Any one familiar with the history of the French Church and pulpit during the present century, must recognize the correctness of the author's judgment in thus fixing and characterizing these *phases*. It would be an interesting study to determine and develop the *causes*, historically, that produced these phases. It was not in the author's plan to do this. He has confined himself to the *character* of these several periods of the French pulpit in the Reformed Church. We may, however, say, that during the first period, French Protestantism simply partook of the *spiritual sleep* that rested then on the entire Protestantism of the Continent; a period filled with the political and moral convulsions of Europe, that had almost entirely subdued all the other concerns of the human soul. The second period marks the reviving of the evangelical spirit in Continental Protestantism, and, among the French especially, the evangelical revival produced by Robert Haldane and others, who traversed France and Switzerland about 1815. "Our modern orthodox," says a French Protestant writer of the rationalist school, "have no ancestors in the French Church; they descend in direct line from the violent islander, Robert Haldane."

"About 1815, several foreign missionaries, among them Robert Haldane, traversed France, preaching to the nerves, rather than to the intelligence and the heart, communicating to their followers more heat than light. Their gross doctrine may be summed up in the dogma of eternal punishment, modified by that of a bloody expiation" (referring to the atonement).*

This is a rationalist's way of stating the case of the *Awakening*. The *Liberalism* of the last period, both among the orthodox and the liberals, is only what has been witnessed alike all over the Protestant world. Among the evangelicals it was, in its good sense, the fruit of better light, and the reaction from extreme dogmatism; among the rationalists, in its bad sense, it has been but the natural result of the downward tendency of the "liberal" faith.

During the *first phase*—the *Sleep*—the pulpit was characterized by dry "moralizing and languor."

"During this period, the Protestant pulpit has but a low ideal. Its scope was that of a treatise on Natural Religion—God, his providence, his wisdom in the works of creation. Add to this, descriptions of nature, ecstasies over the scenes of the rising sun, over the infinite number of the stars, and the immeasurable greatness of the celestial bodies.

"It is especially, and above all, the preaching of moral ideas, appeals to the conscience, religious aphorisms—striving to discourse on the beauty of virtue and the mean-

* *Le Protestantisme Libéral d'Aujourd'hui*. By E. Haag.

ness and leanness of vice, to build up moral theories, as Socrates in the portico, or Zeno in the gardens of the Academy, might have done. . . .

"We find interminable discourses on Duty, Propriety, the Respect Due to the Old, Hasty Judgments, the False Confidence which Prosperity Inspires, the Advantages of Mediocrity! . . . All the known axioms of human wisdom, and the established results of the experience of human life, pass before our eyes. . . . 'A philosophy reasonable, gentle, prudent, moderate; a philosophy the friend of man, and guarding him against his passions, far from being opposed to religion, is nothing else than religion itself,' says Reybaz, one of its representatives. 'Let your alms at least make atonement for your iniquities,' says Durand, another of these. 'As for me, I want to be able to offer to my Supreme Judge, as feeble amends for all my faults, the services I may have rendered,' says another."

Such is a fair indication of the character of the preaching during this period. There seemed to be a horror of the positiveness of Christian doctrine. Morality, morality, was the cry. There were in the pulpit men of talents, of rare attainments, and ability; but their preaching was a dead word. As was the preaching, so also the Church. It was, says our author,

"A society of honest people, descanting on serious subjects. Hence religiousness, rather than Christian piety, the treating of commonplaces that displeases no one, which the vicious listen to with the same pleasure as the virtuous, and which, instead of crushing pride and leading sinful man to know himself, to probe the wounds of his soul, only concealed from him his misery, in entertaining him with the foolish idea that he is able to do good himself, before his heart is renewed by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

"The single man who is an exception to this order of things, and who sheds over this period a little of true evangelical unction, is *Cellerier*, the father. . . . The man, on the contrary, who is the very incarnation of the system of the day, is *Samuel Vincent*."

The *Awakening*, dating from about 1820, brought about a remarkable change.

"It could easily be foreseen that a reaction would take place. . . . The first signs of this reaction revealed themselves at an early date. As early as 1816, feeble traces can be seen. . . . But once commenced, the movement precipitates itself, and from 1822-1823 onward, it is in full expansion in Gaussen and Malan. The doctrinal truths hitherto touched upon with reserve, are now preached with bold power and fullness.

"Jesus, his cross, his expiatory blood, his soul, given as an offering for sin, the corruption of every child of Adam, condemnation as a child of wrath, conversion, fleeing to the Crucified, the assistance of the Holy Spirit necessary for the renewing of the heart,—all these teachings crowd upon us, and accumulate."

The theme of predilection of the preceding period was *Moral Wisdom*; those of the Awakening were *Faith, Repentance*.

"The chief qualities of the preaching of this period were: 1. A lively sense of sin; 2. An ardent love of souls; 3. A profound knowledge of the Scriptures."

But this kind of preaching had also its weak side. It ran into the extremes that are natural in this direction, and that have every-where accompanied it. It was, according to our author—and he has well sustained the charge by abundant citations—attended and weakened by "dogmatism, exaggeration, narrowness." The "theological extravagances, subtle refinements, pious inventions, tones, and violences" which we have seen elsewhere, were also here.

Among the many eminent names of this period, Gaussen, Malan, Vinet, VOL. V.—18

and the Monods appear as the master-spirits of the French pulpit of Geneva and France. These men, with all their errors, natural and pardonable, were great heroes of the evangelical faith, did a great work in the French Protestant world, and are among the noblest men our age has produced.

The last *phase*, which our author marks as *Liberalism*, divides the Protestant pulpit, as also the Church, into two distinct camps—that of *Heterodox* and that of *Orthodox Liberalism*. This period is that of our own day, and yet in full development. The heterodox wing has ripened out into what we call in America, *Liberal Christianity*; generally of the pronounced rationalistic type, though of various *nuances* or shades. It has in it many eminent, honorable names, men of character and power—the Coquerels, father and son, of Paris; Colani, of Strasbourg; Reville, Fontanés, Viguié, Pelissier, and others of higher or lesser fame, are the representatives of this camp. The Nestor, in every sense, of French Liberalism was Coquerel, the father, but lately dead; and his son, a man of extraordinary gifts and most elevated character, is perhaps now its most prominent representative. We can not but regret that such men as the Coquerels and Colani should be lost to evangelical religion in France, and be found in the ranks of its enemies.

Orthodox Liberalism in France is simply the evangelical school freed from its errors of the preceding period—extravagances and narrowness in theological ideas, “pious inventions, tones, and violences” in manner. It has accepted the freer spirit of our day in a good sense, and ranks in intelligence, piety, dignity, and freedom in thought, manner, and life, with the best forms of evangelical Protestantism elsewhere. Its eminent representatives in the pulpit are Monod, Trottet, Bouvier, Coulin, Baistel, Bersier, De Pressensé, D’hombres, and others that might be added.

Our author has given copious, well-selected extracts, illustrative of the various *phases* of the French Protestant pulpit. The second part of the book is devoted to illustrations, by ample quotations, of the “principal subjects to which the French Protestant pulpit, from 1800 to 1866; has devoted its attention and its efforts.” In this part, the author, by most abundant proof, rescues French Protestantism from the charges perpetually made against it by its Catholic foes, of being hostile to good government and public order. Its most eminent pulpit orators are here heard to denounce, in the boldest language, the disorganizing, destructive elements of society, in ideas, systems, and movements; and yet evermore, while proclaiming the highest principles of religion and morality in support of law and good order, advocating also true liberty with all boldness. This book should be read by all who desire to know what French Protestantism really is, as they can best judge of it by hearing—what is here given—its highest religious voice.

3.—*Christliche Sittenlehre.* Von ADOLPH WUTTKE. (Anglo-Saxon Ethics.) Berlin. 1864.

ETHICS, or the science of obligation, has been treated by many English writers in more or less independence of any specific theological system. This course is fundamentally erroneous. It involves either the absence of any clear foundation-principle in the system resulting, or the unnatural and disingenuous actual employment of a principle which the system formally ignores. The result in the first case is a system without center or inner coherency—a mere series of empirical rules and precepts based upon external grounds of calculation, fitness, utility, etc. The result in the second case is an illogical system, resting upon conclusions whose premises are disguised, and addressing itself to all classes and sects; whereas it can, in fact, satisfy only such as stand upon the particular confessional basis from which it really, but unconfessedly, proceeds. In either case, the treatises resulting are devoid of strict scientific character; for a science must not only have a foundation-principle, but it must be actually based thereon. Now, there can be no possible basis for the science of ethics, or of the moral life, elsewhere than in some form of theology; for ethics, or morality, is based on the idea of obligation, and the idea of obligation can not exist in its integrity save as involving the ideas of God and of the relations of creatures to him. And the significance of the idea of obligation varies, step by step, with the manner in which we conceive of God and of these relations. The atheist, for example, in so far as consequential, can not have the idea of obligation at all; the science of ethics can have no more significance for him than magic or astrology for the Christian. At best, he can have but a system of rules of external conduct, looking to external happiness (and mere external conduct has no ethical or moral quality). The consistent pantheist can not possibly have the idea of obligation in the Christian sense; he can only have a mystico-poetic aspiration, either to resolve his personality back into the universe, or to exalt and impersonalize his personality so as to absorb the universe into it. The ethics of the Stoics and of the Epicureans were true expressions of their theologies. The morality of suicide followed, as a matter of course, in both systems; but from different grounds. The question of the nature of evil throws morality into a radically different shape, according as it is decided in one way or in another. If I regard evil as fatalistically inherent in all finite being, I can not rationally make any effort to eradicate it; if I regard it as a necessary transition stage in the development of moral life, I can not look upon it with absolute disapprobation; if I ignore its reality, and look upon actual man as in a normal state, and as capable of true morality, I am tempted to lower the ideal standard to the feeble measure of the actual practices of society. Inside of Christianity, the

animating principle of ethics varies very largely, according to the three principal constructions that are put upon Christian theology. In the one extreme, all help comes to the individual from without, through the mediation of an objective Church, with objective means of grace; in the other extreme, the subjective element is in excess, and moral strength is looked for from within, through the merely personal efforts of the individual. In the evangelical mean position, the objective and the subjective elements are in co-operation, and the individual is regarded as living morally through divinely awakened and stimulated inner spiritual strength. In each and all of these systems, the idea of obligation appears under different conditions, and calls for a different expression in life, and hence conditions a correspondingly different form of ethics.

The error of the common treatises on ethics—moral philosophy, moral science, etc.—is, that they proceed to the erection of their superstructure before having first settled upon and determined the character of the primary truth or principle upon which alone it can rest. As well might one attempt to construct a geometry in disregard of mathematical axioms; as well expect a plant to bear fruit when dissevered from or only loosely connected with its root. The sole basal truth of ethics being the idea of obligation, and the idea of obligation coming to clearness only in connection with some positive conception of God and of the relations of creatures to him—that is, only in some theological system—hence, it follows that ethics, in order to be scientific, must be treated of in organic connection with some form of positive theology. The further a system of ethics is kept from such a theology, the more fully is it severed from the only possible source of its life-blood. A system of ethics is scientific in proportion to its absolute conditionment by such a theology; and it is true in proportion to its conditionment by the absolutely true theology.

It would be superfluous and inopportune to attempt here a positive justification of this position. A negative justification—that arising from the utter and endless and ever-darkening confusion that reigns among those who attempt to find any other principle of obligation than the infinitely rational will of the Christ-revealed God—will suffice. This interminable bewilderment and contradiction clearly indicate that such writers are engaged in the hopeless attempt of putting a scientific construction upon phenomena while considered in organic dissociation from their vitalizing source. They seem to imagine that they must seek out some more immediate, or ultimate, or profound, or scientific, or rational answer to the questions, What is right? why ought I to do the right? what is the good? why ought I to seek and do the good? what is the sole true and only possible motive of virtue? and why ought I to be virtuous? than the answer involved in the idea of the infinitely rational, Christ-revealed

God, and of our relations to him; as thus: Right is conformity or truthfulness to these relations; I ought to conform to these relations, because they, being the expression of infinite reason, my so conforming is absolutely rational: the good is virtue, or the character resultant upon conformity to these relations; I ought to seek and do the good because, in so doing, I conform to the relations under which, and realize the end unto which, infinite reason made me, and consequently act absolutely rationally: the sole possible motive of virtue is an active acceptance of these relations, and of all that is involved therein—in other words, love to God and, for his sake, to all creatures; I ought to be virtuous, that is, I ought to love God, because in so doing I fulfill the end set before me by infinite reason, and consequently act absolutely rationally. The very confusion that has ever attended the effort at finding any higher or lower answer than this to these several forms of one and the same question, forms a strong presumption of the futility of such attempt. And the only plausible objection to this view—namely, that it deprives right, morality, duty, etc., of an absolute and immutable norm, seeing that it subordinates right to volitional discretion on the part of God, and implies that he might ordain contrary standards of right or morality at different times and in different parts of the universe—is entirely groundless, and can only be urged by such as fall into forgetfulness of the fundamental idea of God as the infinitely rational One. For, as infinitely rational, God's will will always will in harmony with the relations under which and with the end unto which it has itself respectively created the several hierarchies of creatures that people the universe; in other words, it will always be truthful to itself, and will always will that creatures be truthful to themselves: so that, in fact, the will of God does constitute an (or rather *the*) absolute, and the absolutely immutable norm of right, duty, virtue, morality, etc., in a word of obligation: so that, consequently, we are under no necessity of suspending any imaginary, abstract, fatalistic, extra-divine rule or norm of right above God for determining his will, lest at any time he chance to will something inconsistent with the relations he himself has established—that is, lest he cease to act infinitely rationally.

The untheological method has some advantages; but it has serious disadvantages. By divorcing ethics from theology, it succeeds, indeed, in producing systems which interest and are studied by persons who have no positive religion; but as these systems lack the very life-blood of ethics—namely, the only truly based idea of obligation—can their influence for good be of a very deep-reaching character? Is not their tendency, in so far as divorced from religion, to encourage to a merely outward morality not rooted in the regenerated heart? And does not their unsettledness, their wavering of view as to the foundation of obligation, tend to

unsettle and becloud the feeling of obligation, and to give undue scope to the fervid fancies and unchastened impulses of revolutionary hot-heads and radicals of every description? And is not much of the wide-spread chafing against Christian order now actually observable in our American social life—much of the antagonism of well-intentioned but overzealous agitators in both Church and State, to certain unquestionable phases of Biblical teaching—attributionable in part to our too prevalent severance of morality from its organic connection with its life-giving root in Christian theology?

We have placed the "Ethics" of Dr. Wuttke at the head of this article, not because we have received this unsurpassed work, but simply as referring to an author who honestly bases this science upon the only Christianly admissible basis.

- 4.—*Das Heutige Ägypten, ein Abriss Seiner Physischen, Politischen, Wirthschaftlichen, und Cultur-Zustände.* Von HEINRICH STEPHAN. *Mit einer Karte.* (The Egypt of To-day. A Sketch of its Physical and Political Condition, National Economy, and State of Civilization. By HEINRICH STEPHAN. With a Map.) Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. 1872. 8vo. pp. 528.

"THERE are few countries outside of Europe," says our author, in the beginning of his Preface, "which have such an attraction for the spirit, and such a charm for the soul, as Egypt. If history gives nobility to the soil, then the Valley of the Nile belongs to the most ancient nobility of lands of this earth. When Hellas, wrapt yet in the mist of mythology, had scarcely begun to appear in the life of nations; when Evander's herds were yet grazing on the Palatine and Aventine, the Kingdom of Egypt had already behind it several thousand years of history. The Pyramids of Gizeh were already over a thousand years old when the patriarch Abraham came to Egypt. Venerable by its age, respected because of its strong State organization, famous by reason of its arts and sciences, Egypt was, for the most eminent minds of the Greeks of earlier times, a land of desire. A journey thither was to them an object of education, which furnished to them, in politics and the arts, the united results which we, considering the changed condition of our times, may secure by a tour to England and to Italy. Thales and Democritus, Hecateus and Herodotus, Lycurgus and Solon, Pythagoras and Plato, Cænopides and Eudoxus, walked in the vast halls of the Isis and Hathor temple, in the shade of the royal sycamores of the Nile, whose figs they ate in leaving, to secure to themselves, according to the ancient tradition, the return to the beautiful land. In the tombs of Benihassan, a thousand years before the Trojan War, we find the development of the ground-forms of the Doric column, and involuntarily, in the midst of those rock-caves and grave-chambers, we exclaim: 'Ah, I recognize thee, plastic spirit!'"* To the oldest representatives of the three great developments of art, Homer, Orpheus, and Dædalus, Greek tradition attributes a sojourn in Egypt. (Diodorus i, 96, 98.) It may be said, that through the Hellenic world resounds an echo of a Memnon-sound from Thebes. The painted and chiseled inscriptions on the temple walls and pylones proclaim moral maxims and philosophical views, in which we can clearly recognize the origin of many doctrines of the monotheistic religions, and meet with a strongly developed consciousness of the connection of our earthly existence with a higher being, a living conviction of the working of a universal, creative, guiding order. Also, in relation to the knowledge of the cosmical conditions, the studies and labors that had gone out from Egypt were for a long time of decisive importance. The investigations of Eratosthenes, the system of Ptolemy, to a good

* Goethe's "Wanderer."

degree, ruled science to the Middle Ages. If our youth learn to know the Persians, Greeks, Macedonians, Romans, and Carthaginians, first from wars and battles, Egypt presents itself to us, already in the first impressions we receive of it in our early childhood, from the stories of our sacred books of this land, in an altogether different light. The Nile, the father of blessings, as the Arabs yet call it, whose waters bore the cradle of the great founder of the first religion that taught one God; the solitary garden of Heliopolis, in whose shade the legend fixes the resting-place of the holy family,—these stand nearer to the foundation of our civilization than the poetically glorified Scamander or the Clivus Capitolinus in the midst of mighty nations."

With such high and fitting inspirations the author introduces us to his study of this wonderful land in its condition to-day. For our part, we want to see a man come to such a study with just such an inspiration that need not, and will not, hide from him the realities of the present; but, on the contrary, will the better fit him with enlightened eye and lofty spirit of just appreciation to see and study these realities in their relation to the great past and the possible and probable future. The true historical interpreter and prophet, the historical teacher, must needs have this inspiration. The introduction shows to us that we have a man before us competent to his task.

The author has made the Egypt of to-day a subject of exhaustive study, as we learn from his Preface, and as the reading of the book verifies, calling to his aid all the literary resources, already considerable, and complementing these with extensive intelligent personal observations made during a long stay in Egypt.

The book is divided into seven parts: 1. Land and People; 2. National Economics and Agricultural Arrangements; 3. Government and Administration; 4. Finance; 5. Religion and Justice; 6. Trade, Communication, and Industry; 7. The Suez Canal. On all these subjects the author has given us, perhaps, the best information allowed by the limits of his book, combining the primary duty of communicating facts and correct appreciations with the just aim of awakening and sustaining, by manner and style, a lively interest on the part of the reader. The deep interest in the writer himself, with eminent talents of seeing and understanding and describing well, keeps up a reciprocal interest also in the reader to the very end; and you—if you are capable of it—rise up from the reading of this book, with not only a rich store of knowledge acquired, but also with a high appreciation, almost enthusiastic, of this wonderful land of the Nile.

We may have some conception of what progress Egypt has been making under the energetic, enlightened rule of the khedive and his predecessor, Mehemet Ali, when we look at the extraordinary increase of population, especially in the cities and large towns. Alexandria, once the second city in the Roman Empire, at the end of last century had only about 6,000 inhabitants—its population is now 200,000. Cairo (El-Kahira; that is, the Victorious), in 1863, had a population of 440,000;

Damietta, 42,000; Rosetta, 22,000; Zagazig, chief city of the land of Goshen, 20,000, etc. Immigration is constantly increasing.

"From the South come the Berbers and the Nubians, who seek employment and gain, and generally remain in the country. In Suez we meet Mohammedan Hindoos, who, for the same purpose, come in the East India steamers. Among the merchants of the bazaars in Alexandria and Cairo, you see many Syrians and Armenians; the latter also in the offices of the Government. The chief contingent of Egyptian immigration comes from Europe. The number of passengers arriving in Egypt may be judged from the following figures: In Alexandria there landed from Europe, in 1856, 33,429; 1860, 28,924; 1864, 56,612; 1865, 74,990; 1866, 50,317, etc. Of these, about six per cent pass on through Egypt, the remainder, ninety-four per cent, remain. This does not include the arrivals in Suez, Port-Saïd, and Damietta, the other chief-ports of the land. On the whole, the Europeans succeed well in Egypt. They bring with them skill and industry, and not seldom capital and good habits; though to the last there are unfortunately exceptions."

Among the other influences of Western Europe in regenerating Egypt may be named, also, the remarkable fact of the creation of a *Chamber of Deputies*. What would the old caliphs have thought of this? what would have been thought of this by the rulers of Egypt even one generation back?

"On the 27th of November, 1866, the khedive opened in Cairo the first meeting of the Chamber of Deputies of the land, the *Meglis Schora el Nuab*, called to control the administration and to settle the budget. This Chamber has been convoked every year since. The period of election is three years, and the sessions may extend to sixty days. . . . When the delegates of the land, or more properly from the land—for the mode of election even is unknown to most of the members—for the first time met in Cairo, and were proceeding to the session-hall in the citadel near the fatal Mameluke Place, some one who had learned parliamentary drill in the Corps Legislatif in Paris, betrayed to the worthy scheiks and scherifs the secret that the representatives favorable to the Government were in the habit of taking their seats on the right. In consequence of this important revelation, when the notables had dismounted from their donkeys, and the doors of the hall were opened, there was such a rush and crush of turbans and kaftans for the right corner of the room, that from words it would soon have come to blows, had not the official announcement that it did not matter about the place, as the Government was perfectly assured of the entire devotion of all the members, put an end to this zeal and conflict of Oriental loyalty."

In due form, this august assembly is always opened with a "speech from the throne." How perfect is the imitation in this likewise, will be seen in the following specimen of 1870. It opened as follows:

"I greet you, gentlemen Deputies. I thank Providence that the past year has been prosperous and satisfactory to all, and that the cultivation of the soil has in all parts of the land been very productive. Let us hope that the Almighty may also hereafter, in his great goodness, bestow upon us his blessing. As regards the administration of the country for the past year, the ministers will communicate to you, as in the previous sessions, the information you desire about the acts of the Government. The discussions and decisions of the last session of representatives have been of unquestionable advantage to the land. Your predecessors did the country great service, and returned to their homes accompanied by universal esteem. I doubt not that your consultations will have the same result. Our harmonious views and our common efforts have, as their aim, the general prosperity, the development of national wealth and of civilization. I direct my ardent prayer to Allah, that he may grant us his aid, and that he may crown our unselfish efforts with success."

Some of the other "addresses from the throne" went more into details, giving an account of the affairs of the Government. Our author well remarks:

"Mehemet Ali, the otherwise so bold innovator, would have turned himself in his grave, in the great alabaster mosque in the citadel of Cairo, at the very thought of making to his subjects such revelations. Even the well-disposed Saïd-Pasha only went so far as to create a State Council (November, 1856), which was composed of the princes of the blood, four generals, and four high dignitaries, who gave their voice only in the most important affairs of the country, drafts of laws and organizations." (Page 173.)

But even the old Oriental world is moving!

Another power of civilization, the journalistic press, is well represented in Egypt. The following list of Egyptian newspapers speaks well for the enlightened policy of its ruler, and surely indicates real progress:

"In Alexandria, *l'Égypte*, an official organ, daily, political and literary; *le Nil*, tri-weekly, political, literary, and commercial; *l'Avvenire d'Egitto*, and *l'Internazionale*, the same; *le Progrès Égyptien*, the opposition paper, as far as is possible, under the censorship, semi-weekly, containing also able articles on the commercial, financial, and other public matters of Egypt; *la Trombetta*, daily, marine and trade journal; *Manifesto Giornaliero*, daily, political and commercial organ; *Echo*, Greek journal. In Cairo, *Wadi-el-Nil* (Valley of the Nile), in Arabic, political, commercial, and literary, published on every Mohammedan Sabbath (Friday). It is common to see groups of Arabs sitting in the bazaars and coffee-houses, by the fountains and the mosques, listening to improvisators reading to them this journal, instead of reciting to them the glories of 'A Thousand and One Nights,' etc. . . . Finally, *Wakie Misrie*—that is, 'Egyptian Events'—an official Government organ, in the Arabic and Turkish languages. In Alexandria, Cairo, Suez, Damietta, Port-Saïd, etc., many foreign, especially French and Italian newspapers, are kept."

Education has not been overlooked in Egypt, though, of course, much can not be yet looked for. The once so renowned University of Cairo, when Arabic learning was in its glory, *Al Azhar* (the Flower-bloom) yet exists. Though limited in its range of studies, it has a wide renown, and is visited by students from Turkey, Asia Minor, Arabia, East India, and many parts of Africa. It numbers several thousands of students, of whom two thousand are supported by the Government. Its teachers are two hundred and sixty.

"Under the reign of Saïd-Pasha, and especially of the present khedive, the educational system of Egypt has entered upon a new path of development. Especially since the year 1868 has the establishment of Government educational institutions taken place in a remarkable manner, in the chief places of the country. In 1870, there were in these schools four thousand students, who received instruction and support, including clothing, gratis. These schools embrace elementary, and then a higher grade of instruction. The elementary course embraces learning to read and write Arabic, Arithmetic, Drawing, and French, or some other foreign language, according to the necessities of the locality. From the elementary classes, the students pass into the second-grade school, which embraces the following divisions: 1. The Preparatory School, with a three-years' course: Study of Arabic, Turkish, French, and English, Mathematics, Drawing, History, and Geography. 2. The Special Schools; into one of these the student enters after having finished the three-years' course, in which he has received the general scholastic

foundation. These Special Schools are: *a.* The Polytechnic School; four-years' course. After passing through this, the student can choose, as in France, between the civil and military career. In the first case, he enters for two years into the Administration School, (in 1870 this had seventy-five students), and then into the State service; in the second case, he enters into the Military Academy of the *Abbasieh*, near Cairo. In 1871, the Polytechnic School had eighty scholars, against sixty of the year before. *b.* The School of Law, in process of formation in connection with the designed above-described remodeling of the judicial system. It will embrace Islamic law, but, above all, also the Roman law; a most desirable progress. The course will be four years. *c.* The Philosophical and Arithmetical School, including Drawing of Plans, Higher Mathematics, Philology, Rhetoric, Prosody, etc. *d.* The School of Art and Industry (in Bulak), founded by Mehemet Ali, and essentially perfected under Ismail-Pasha. This has a three-years' course, and numbers at present one hundred students, against fifty in 1869. *e.* The School of Medicine, with seventy-five pupils, connected with a school for midwives (at present sixty-five students), the only one existing in the Orient. *f.* The Marine School at Alexandria, numbering already eighty-five students. The Egyptian Government has lately called the eminent German, Professor Heinrich Brugsch, of Göttingen, under very honorable conditions, to Cairo, to found there an academy for Archaeology—especially to call into fuller life the study of Egyptology."

The author justly says, that Egypt is one vast monumental museum, the richest on earth. The khedive is planning a magnificent museum-building in the most beautiful public place in Cairo—the Esbekieh—and is determined to do his utmost to preserve and bring out the immense treasures of Egyptian antiquity for the use of science.

We conclude our extracts with a significant paragraph. The author discusses well the hope of regenerating Egypt, and through it the Islamic Orient, by the means of the power of Western Christian culture. He concludes thus:

"Abandonment of the Islamic foundation! Often have I discussed this subject with enlightened Mohammedans, at an earlier date, and more recently. The usual objection is: 'If your faith could only in reality bring us something better!' They point to the divisions, the incessant controversies in the Christian Church; and are, by the way, astonishingly well instructed in these matters. They are quite familiar with the history of the Arians, the great Schism, the persecution of heretics, Dominicans and Jesuits, the Reformation and the quarrels of the Reformers among themselves, as well as the conflicts now called forth in the Catholic Church by the late Vatican Council. When they speak about these things, they reveal a certain self-complacent satisfaction, which always reminds me of the laughing Turk that Hogarth represents looking in at the window of the chapel in which a fanatic preacher and the Methodists are in full activity. If, laying aside the question of doctrine, you call attention to the noble fruits, the great results of Christian culture in the Western States, they readily acknowledge these, but point to the dark side of an over-civilization, the social question, and the latest frightful outbreak precisely in that city which has served them as the representative of Western culture. They refer to the destructive party conflicts, the corrupting journalistic literature that is sapping the foundations of all good, the destruction of the peace of the individual, as well as of society, by the universal restlessness, conflicts, and chasing to and fro; and they insist at least upon *this* advantage of the Orient, that there is yet a regard for authority, and a natural simplicity of tastes and manners."

The author speaks in enthusiastic terms, and entertains the highest hopes of the Suez Canal, in its influence, not only on Egypt, but on the

Orient generally, and on the world. He gives the highest praise to the noble men that, against such great obstacles, have brought it to a successful completion. He has devoted one hundred pages of his book to this great work.

-
- 5.—*Goettinger Professoren. Ein Beitrag zur Deutschen Cultur- und Literatur-Geschichte; in acht Vorträgen.* (Goettinger Professors. A contribution to the History of German Culture and Literature; in Eight Lectures.) Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes. 1872. 12mo. pp. 260.

THESE lectures have for their subjects some of the most eminent names that have figured in the academical history of the *Georgia-Augusta*, the renowned University of Göttingen, and were delivered for a pious purpose by distinguished professors now teaching in the University. The following are the eight lectures: 1. Johann Lorenz von Mosheim, by Dr. Ehrenfeuchter; 2. Albrecht von Haller, by Dr. Heule; 3. Johann Matthias Gesner and Christian Gottlob Heyne, by Dr. Sauppe; 4. Johann Stephan Pütter and Karl Friedrich Eichhorn, by Dr. Zachariæ; 5. Blumenbach, by Dr. Grisebach; 6. Jacob Grimm, by Dr. Goedeke; 7. Gauss, by Professor Sartorius von Waltenhausen; 8. Göttingen Historians, from Köhler to Dahlmann, by Professor Dr. Waitz.

The *Academia Georgia-Augusta*, or better known simply as the University of Göttingen, has a glorious past history among the great "high-schools" of Germany. The number of its students sometimes—before the destructive period of 1831, which gave it a severe blow—amounted to twelve hundred. How familiar and how dear once were to German students the Muses' haunts "an der Leine"—the little river of Göttingen—is known to all well read in the history of German scholars of the last century and the beginning of the present. "Göttingen" was one of the hallowed spots for the literary youth of Germany—a temple where their hearts worshiped; and many a tender "pious" passage we meet, in verse and prose, in which her sons pour out their grateful remembrance of the "loving mother." "*Extra Gottingam, vivere non est vivere*," said one of her best men, in the days of her glory. Heinrich Heine, the cynical, keen satirist, it is true, spoke otherwise of her. "Göttingen," he says, "is a city which is famous for its sausages and its University; belongs to the King of Hanover, and has four classes of inhabitants, differing but little from each other; namely, students, professors, Philistines, and cattle—the last being the most important." Thus this biting, venomous Israelite poured out his spite on Göttingen; the secret of which is simply, as a *causa sufficiens*, the fact that he was expelled from the University.

In 1831, the University suffered a severe check. The liberal, revolutionary movement going out from France was felt powerfully among the

students of Göttingen, not sparing the professors. The tyrannical king, Ernest Augustus, once Duke of Cumberland, visited the University with his despotic fury, and soon banished seven liberal professors—among them the brothers Grimm, Dahlmann, Ewald, and Gervinus, all of whom were enthusiastically received in other parts of Germany. The number of students at once sank down. The death of the tyrant, the independence of Hanover (now, however, alas! lost), a wiser and more liberal policy, gradually restored the University to power and influence.

Among the names that form the subjects of these eight lectures, those best known to the world generally are Mosheim,* Haller, Heyne, Eichhorn, and Grimm. Of Mosheim, as an ecclesiastical historian, in which character he is generally best known, Dr. Ehrenfeuchter says:

"Mosheim marks in the treatment of Church history a new epoch. There are four points in which he, compared with previous Church historians, gives a direction for the better. In the first place, in the form of narration; for, although he does not yet free himself from the form of a text-book, in that he retains the regular series of paragraphs, the contents of which he then develops more fully in a subjoined exposition, he nevertheless, even in this, established a certain higher dignity of historical treatment. The progress in history-writing, already attained at that time in other countries, especially England, gained entrance through him also in Germany. With this is intimately connected the second peculiarity—the wider range of view in which our author contemplates the facts in Church history. We may say it is the stand-point of the *world*, which the author occupies in contemplating and setting forth his materials. Always in close connection with the general conditions of civilization, and the general life of humanity, he describes the facts and events in the circle of the Church. As the third point, is to be noted the criticism, which—while of course it can never be separated from all genuine history—for the first time again, since Calixtus, received a decided and fully declared representative in the treatment of Church history. Criticism, it is true, had already been previously cultivated; but it was, so to speak, a *material* criticism; it was the polemical tendency of dogmatics that influenced also Church history, sitting in judgment on the unevangelical elements that had penetrated into the forms of the ancient, and more into those of the mediæval, Church. But now the criticism of *form* also asserted itself—the criticism of the transmission of historical accounts, as it had already long since been known and practiced in philology. Yet, as it could not have been otherwise expected from the cautious man, this new, recognized criticism appears in him in a very moderate degree. The fourth, and in many respects most important, innovation that Mosheim introduced, is the attempt to divide history into epochs. The older historians made but little or no use of such a division. And, in reality, it is true that such a division interrupts the connected course of historical representations, brings a thought born of a scientific reflection—the result gained from a connected view of facts—by anticipation into the very midst of single facts, and appears to disturb the simple current of the narration demanded by the canon of time. But it is exactly the demands of the mind and of knowledge, which desire to be satisfied by the simple narration of facts, that call for such a division; and certainly more than the history of any other department does that of the Church, that proceeds from so clear a point of beginning, and is going forward to so clearly decided an issue, demand the effort at a proper order of analytical arrangement."

We have quoted this passage, as it points out the defect in Mosheim's Church history, once, and with many even yet, so popular; and as it also offers the best argument in its defense.

*It is really painful to hear the so common outrage on this worthy name—Mosheim. If you can do no better, say at least Mos-heem; but better pronounce it decently, Mos-hime (heim)!

As a preacher—once a model for Germany—and as a theologian, Mosheim had his acknowledged merits and serious defects. The most eminent service he did for theology was his Church History.

The name of Heyne—Christian Gottlob Heyne—is well known to the student of the ancient classics. In the midst of the extremest poverty, this afterward so eminent linguist broke for himself the path to knowledge, learning, and fame. It is this mighty, heroic wrestling of the spirit often with the obstacles that rise in its path, that endows it with true greatness, and alone insures its crown of real fame.

"Heyne was born in Chemnitz, September 25, 1729. His father, a poor weaver, working day and night, could scarcely procure the dry bread for his children. Often the mother wrung her hands and wept when, on Saturday evening, she returned home without having been able to sell the product of her husband's labors; and when the older sister and Heyne had to go about barefoot, to offer the father's work for a few pennies less, there grew up in the ingenuous boy's head an anger against the rich, and a bitterness against humanity, that threw dark shadows over his spirit throughout life."

"With two florins, he came (1748) to Leipzig, to the University. But the man that promised aid forgot him. For days he starved, because he had not even a few pennies to buy bread. A servant-girl in the house where he had his cheerless room, took pity on him, and of her earnings bought him bread." . . . "On an invitation of Count Brühl, he went to Dresden in 1752; but a gracious reception was all he received. Alone, without any acquaintance, without money, without employment, he was for a long time near starvation. Empty pea-pods, that he gathered and boiled, were often all he had to eat. A theological student took him to his room; here he slept, as he had no bed, on the bare floor, with a book for his pillow."

These were the deep waters through which this noble spirit toiled onward, thirsting for knowledge, to the glorious goal. And he reached it!

"In the year 1754 could be often seen, in the large, splendid library of Count Brühl, at Dresden, two young men, both unattractive in appearance and poorly clad; the one insatiable in demands for books; the other, however obliging, in ill-humor at these incessant calls for books, scarcely known to him even by name. Who would have thought that within the next two decades, these two young men would be known and admired far through the world of their own time, and would live in the grateful memory of coming generations? The youth so eager for books was *Johann Jacob Winkelmann*; the poor copyist of the library (an appointment finally received) was *Christian Gottlob Heyne*."

All honor to Heyne, and all the noble souls, who, with a burning thirst for knowledge, are beaten back by no obstacle, and crushed by no adversity! These are the true nobles of learning, the real *studiosi*. How very small, beside such lofty spirits, are the pretended students who, poor, can yet undergo no unusual, trying deprivations with heroic fortitude; who are upborne by no all-conquering high purpose within; but believe it is the world's duty to bear them up in their hands, and who can and will only advance when wind and tide are in their favor!

We add a fine, expressive word of Jacob Grimm, which we find here in the interesting sketch of the life of the two brothers: "The thought is the lightning, the word is the thunder, the consonants the bones, the vowels the blood, of language."

- 6.—*Die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelischen Geschichte.* Von J. L. FUELLER, *Evang. Pfarrer.* (The Credibility of the Evangelical History. By J. L. FUELLER, Evangelical Pastor.) Bale: C. Detloff. 1871. 12mo. pp. 249.

THIS book is published by an "Association for the Diffusion of Christian Writings," whose object evidently is to counteract, by the dissemination of sound, evangelical literature, the current of infidel, and especially rationalistic, sentiment, so common in the lands of German speech. The author of this book is already well known by his work on the Old Testament, which obtained the prize offered by this Association, and another admirable work on the Prophet Daniel, a part of the Old Testament so much assailed by rationalistic unbelief.

The object of this book is, in a simple, popular style, to meet in a thorough, convincing manner the objections to the New Testament history. The earnest words with which the author opens his Introduction, show the spirit of powerful, triumphant faith that moves throughout the whole book:

"When Pilate once asked the question, '*What is truth?*' not from a desire after truth, but rather from despair of ever reaching it; not to find it, but to deny that such a thing existed,—there stood before him the man that had said, '*I am the truth.*' Strange contrast! The one maintains there is no truth; the other not only declares the contrary, but says that it has been revealed in himself. Who is right? Sad, indeed, were it, if Pilate were right; for the desire after truth is planted in the heart of man. Is he to be condemned forever to long after it,—and lo, there is none? No; he that created the thirst has also given the water to quench it. *The longing after truth is the proof that there is truth.*

"Is, then, the other right, who says, '*I am the truth?*' It is a wonderful word, one of the greatest that ever were spoken. It is not, '*I teach, I announce the truth,*' but '*I am the truth.*' What man could so speak? Truth is called the daughter of heaven, because it reigns in heaven, and comes only from above. Did that man come from heaven; and, like Prometheus, did he steal the spark of truth from heaven? But then he might indeed say, '*I bring,*' but not '*I am the truth!*' '*I am the truth,*' we could allow it if God said this of himself; but for a weak, mortal man, it is too good. But, behold, this one claims also to be more than man. His disciples confess that he is Christ, *the Son of the living God,* and for this he calls them blessed; and before his judges he confesses and declares with an oath that he is *the Son of God.* For this, indeed, he is condemned to death as a blasphemer, and nailed to the cross; but this does not confound his disciples, who for this faith joyfully meet death. And his favorite disciple, declaring him to be the Word promised to man, says, '*The Word was with God, and the Word was God;*' and again, '*This is the true God and everlasting life.*' If this be true, then could he say of himself, '*I am the truth.*'"

The author is right. Here, with *Christ* in his true divine character, in his *Godhood*, is the beginning of the matter; here it all rests. Such a book as this has a great mission among the German people, so deeply sunken in the sea of unbelief, and so terribly suffering from the consequent moral decay. May God give it great currency, and a rich harvest of returning faith in God and his Christ!

7. —*Die Offenbarung des Johannes.* Von J. P. LANGE. (The Revelation of John. By J. P. LANGE.) 1871. pp. 302.

THIS is the last part of Lange's Bible-work on the New Testament, and is the work of Dr. Lange himself. We have space only to say that it is one of the most elaborate portions of this new Commentary. There are here sixty-seven closely printed, large octavo pages of introduction, embracing a very thorough examination of every question involved in the discussion of this book—of historical and internal criticism—as well as admirable introductions to the Commentary itself; and, finally, a very complete, detailed analysis of the book. Dr. Lange does not hesitate to accept John the apostle as the author of Revelation, and in other respects proceeds in the path of a "believing criticism and interpretation." On the thousand-years' reign of Christ, page 227, he says:

"The prophecy of the thousand-years' reign of Christ on earth is in and of itself a real pearl of Christian truth and knowledge, because it brings light into an entire series of difficult points of Christian truth.

"It enables us, in the first place, to understand the Judgment-day, since it shows how this is expanded into a thousand years in a symbolical sense—that is, to a specific æon—and throws light also backward on the signification of the days of creation.

"It brings us, in the second place, to the understanding of a catastrophe which is to separate between this state and the beyond, between time and eternity, the world of beginning and progress (*des Werdens*) and the world of consummation, by showing how the great, immense contrast and opposition is obliterated by an æonic transition-period altogether in harmony with the laws of life and life-development, as already recognized by Irenæus.

"Especially does it make clear the fact of the resurrection of the dead, since it brings in before the general resurrection a first resurrection, in harmony with the apostle Paul. (1 Cor. xv, 23.) Thus the resurrection is designated as a *progressive* event, which is determined by spiritual relations. We understand, therefore, that the believer even here, in a sense, meets the resurrection (Philip iii, 11); that the germ of the resurrection is gradually developed in him (Rom. viii); that the beginnings of the resurrection commence with him at his transfer from this life to the next (2 Cor. v, 1); that the believers in their maturing for the resurrection, as blossoms for the general resurrection, antecede the rest of men an entire age, what at once indicates a higher form of resurrection; and that Christ must be the firstling and the principle of the entire resurrection. (Eph. i, 20.)"

Whether we agree with Dr. Lange in all his expositions or not, all must certainly allow that this is one of the ablest, completest, and *most valuable* of his own productions in his Bible-work.

REVIEW.

La Revue Chretienne. December, 1872; January, 1873.

THIS monthly comes to us freighted, as usual, with valuable, well-written articles. The December number contains as its heavy articles: "Oecolampade, le Réformateur de Bâle," by Louis Ruffet; "Le Relèvement Moral de France" (a very common topic now in France), by R. St.

Hilaire: an Address delivered in the South of France; Notices of Books; and the Review of the Month, by de Pressensé—always well done.

Monsieur St. Hilaire, in his Address on the "Regeneration of France," says:

"Constitutional monarchy was the dream of my youth from 1830 to 1848; but the Empire has cured me of my illusions, and I hope it has also cured France! It is enough to have endured for twenty years this parody of representative government, in which we had only its abuses, without a single one of its benefits. For the loss of liberty, the Empire did not even give us order; for by flattering the people it has brought forth the *Commune*, and reopened the era of revolutions. And yet France, deceived by its *plebiscite*, anointed it anew by seven millions of votes. It believed it was voting peace, and it was found that it had voted war!

"A great man, the minister and friend of Henry IV, the most popular of our kings, cherished during all his life a noble dream, which others, more fortunate than we, I hope will some day see realized! The dream of Sully was to found, under the name of *Christian Republic*, a sort of tribunal of arbitration, that would cite to its bar the peoples or the kings that would make war on each other, judge those quarrels that ordinarily are settled only by the sword, and fall with all the power of combined Europe on those who refused to submit to this tribunal of peace. In other words, Sully, in the name of the noblest sentiments that can dwell in the human heart—religion and humanity—wanted to declare war against war, and extirpate it from our unhappy earth, which it has desolated so many thousands of years!

"For myself, I have no language to express the horror I feel of war, no reprobation severe enough for those who let it loose in cold blood on a people hungry for peace, as was France in 1870. But to realize the beautiful dream of Sully, Europe must first be republican, and then it must be Christian. In awaiting, then, the day which our children will perhaps see, the day when war will disappear from this earth, which it has so long devastated, let us commence by founding in France a *Christian Republic*, as a beginning of that of Sully! Unbelief, free-thinking, have made their trials, and are powerless to found any thing. Catholicism is judged and condemned; it has said its final word at the Vatican; it has declared war against all the aspirations of the age, against all the conquests of civilization. As a religion, it has ceased to respond to the true aspirations of the human soul, it has confiscated the Gospel, it has suppressed Jesus Christ!

"It is time for the reign of traditions to come to an end, and for that of the Gospel to begin. Societies are not founded on dead abstractions, like reason, truth, law; nor are they founded on the commandments of men, or dogmas of human fabrication, but on living realities, on a Messiah, a God made flesh, who gave his life to save us. . . . Nations, like individuals, must abase themselves that God may exalt them in stretching out to them that paternal hand which strikes only to cure!"

With a mighty voice are all the true, believing men among the Protestants of France teaching these great, salutary lessons to their people; and surely not without some effect!

The January number has the first article on "St. Beuve and Christianity," by Ch. Secretan; "The Antecedents of the Philosophy of the Renaissance," a lecture at the Sorbonne, by Professor Ch. Waddington; "The Revolution in Prussia," by E. Doumargne; Book Notices; and the Review of the Month. Professor Waddington's lecture is of rare interest, and worthy of this scholarly, philosophical mind—an honor to Protestant France.